THE UNBISHOPING OF

TIMOTHY and TITUS

AND OF THE

Angel of the Church of EPHESUS:

OR,

A brief Elaborate *Discourse*, proving *Timothy* and the ANGEL to be no first, sole, or Diocesan Bishop of *Ephesus*, nor *Titus* of *Crete*; and that the power of *Ordination*, or *Imposition of hands*, belongs *Jure Divino* to *Presbyters*, as well as to *Bishops*, and not to Bishops only, as Bishops; who by *Divine Institution* are evidenced to be one and the same with *Presbyters*, and *many* over *one City*, *Church*, not *one* over *many Cities* or *Churches*.

Wherein all Objections, Pretences to the contrary are fully answered; and the pretended *Superiority* of bishops over other Ministers and Presbyters, and their sole *Right of Ordination Jure Divino*, (now much contended for) are utterly subverted in a most perspicuous manner.

By *WILLIAM PRYNNE* Esquire, Bencher of *Lincolns-Inne*; a Well-wisher to Gods truth, the *KINGS* just Prerogative, the Peoples Liberties, and the Churches Peace.

Matth. 15. 13.

Every Plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted out.

Chrysostom. Opus imperfectum in Matth. Hom 35.

Quicunque desideraverit Primatum in terra, inveniet in Cœlo confusionem; ut jam inter servos Christi non sit de Primatu certamen.

First Compiled, Printed in the year 1636. Reprinted with Additions for publike good and satisfaction, *Anno* 1661. for *Edward Thomas* at the *Adam* and *Eve* in *Little-Britain*.

To the Right Reverend Fathers in God, *WILLIAM* Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*: And *RICHARD* Lord Archbiſhop of *York*, Primates and Metropolitans of all *ENGLAND*.

MY *Lords*, I have ſundry times heard both of you jointly and ſeverally proteſting even in open Court, not only in the * *High Commiſſion*, but in Dr. *Laytons*, and two other caſes ſince, in the *Star-chamber* (whether ſeriouſly or vauntingly only, let the event determine,) *That if you could not prove your Epiſcopal Juriſdiction and Function which you now claim and exerciſe over other Miniſters, and your ſelves as you are Biſhops, to be ſuperior in power, dignity and degree to other Miniſters,* Jure Divino (a Doctrine *which* (a) Patrick Adamſon, *Archbiſhop of S.* Andrews *in* Scotland, *publickly recanted in the Synod of* Fiffe, *Anno* 1591. *as directly repugnant to, and having no foundation at all in the word of God,*) You *would forthwith caſt away your* Rochets *off your backs, lay down your Biſhopricks at his Majeſties feet, and not continue Biſhops one hour longer.* What your Lordſhips have ſo oft averred, and publikely promiſed before many witneſſes, (I hope *bonâ fide*, becauſe judicially in full

* *In Maſter* Thomas Brewers, *Doctor* Baſtwicks, *and ſundry other caſes ſince.*

a *An. Melvini Patricii Adamſoni Palinodia*, printed *Anno* 1630.

Court upon good advise, not rashly on some sudden fit of choler,) I shall make bold, to challenge you to make good without more delay; either by giving solid, satisfactory, speedy answer to this short *Treatise*, (consisting only of two *Questions*, which you may divide between you, and so speedily reply to it, if your great (*b*) *secular occasions*, not *your praying and* (c) *frequent preaching*, *which are truly Episcopal*, though you deem them over-mean imployments for Archbishops, interrupt you not) which manifests all that *Jus Divinum* which hitherto both or either your Lordships have pretended for your Episcopalities, to be but a meer absurd ridiculous fiction, having not the least shadow of Scripture to support it; or in case you either cannot or fail to give such an Answer to it in convenient time; by pulling off your *Rochets, and resigning up your Archbishopricks (which without all question are but a meer humane and no divine Institution, as I have evidenced:) into his Majesties hands, (*d*) *from whom*, you dare not deny, *you onely and wholly received them, With all your Episcopall Jurisdiction and Authority thereunto Annexed*, whereby you difference your selves from, or advance your selves above your Fellow-Ministers, as their supream Lords, unless you will split your selves against the hard rock of a Præmunire, and the Statutes of 26. *H.* 8. c. 1. 31. *H.* 8. c. 9. 10. 37. *H.* 8. c. 17. 1 *Ed.* 6. c. 2. 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. 5. *Eliz.* c. 8. 1. 8. *Eliz.* c. 1. which Acts as they will inform your Lordships, notwithstanding all your former vaunts and brags of divine right, *That the Archbishops, Bishops, Arch-deacons, and other Ecclesiasticall persons of this Realme, HAVE NO MANNER OF JURISDICTION ECCLESIASTICALL, BUT BY, UNDER AND FROM THE KINGS ROYAL MAJESTY; to whom by holy Scripture ALL AUTHORITY AND POWER IS WHOLY GIVEN, to hear and determine all manner of causes Ecclesiasticall, and to correct vice and sin whatsoever, and to all such persons as his* * *Majesty shall appoint thereunto: That all authority and Jurisdiction spiritual and temporal is derived and deducted from the Kings Majesty, as supreme head of the Church and Realm of* England, *and so justly acknowledged by the Clergy thereof:*

b *See Master Tyndals Obedience of a Christian man. And the holy Practise of Popish Prelates.* 1 *Tim.* 1. 2. 3. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. to 5. *Tit.* 1. and 2. 1 *Pet.* 5 2. 3.

d 31 *H.* 8. c. 9. 37 *H.* 8. c. 17. 1 *E.* 6. c. 1. and all the Bishops Patents for their consecration and Cong. def. destier.

* *Not Archbishops or Bishops, who can make no Chancellours, Vicar-generals, Commissaries or Officials, unless the King by his special Patents give them power so to do in expres words, as these Statutes evidence, and the Bishops Patents in Ed. the 6th. raign*

thereof: That all Courts Ecclesiasticall within the Realm were then (and now ought to be, though they are not) *kept by no other power or authority either forraign or within the Realm, but by the authority of his Most excellent Majesty only; and that by vertue of some special Commission, or Letters Patents under his Majesties great Seal, and in his name and right alone: That all power of Visitation of the Ecclesiastical State and persons* (*much more then of our* Universities exempt from Archiepiscopal and Episcopall Jurisdiction) *is united and annexed as part of the royal prerogative to the King imperial Crown, and to be executed by none but by Patents under him: And that all your Citations, processe, Excommunications, Probates of Wils, Commissions of Administration, &c. ought to be made only in his Majesties name, and sealed with his Seal, as they were in* * *King* Henry *the eight, and King* Edward the 6. days, witness the Bishops registers, Processe and Probates of Wils in their two Reigns (and now are *in your High Commission*) that so both the Courts and Processe might be † *known to be his Majesties by leaving his Image, stile and superscription engraven on them*, and to be derived unto you, not by any divine right, but by his Princely grace alone, *who hath as absolute an Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction as any of his Royal Progenitors enjoyed, both by the Laws of God and* (a) *of the Realm*: So they will inforce your Lordships to acknowledge, (unless you will renounce your Allegiance to your most gracious Soveraign whose meer grace hath advanced you to what you now are and enjoy) that all your Episcopal Jurisdiction, whereby you are distinguished from, or elevated above any ordinary Presbyters and Ministers, is not from any divine Charter or Commission from Christ, but * *only in, by, from, and under his Majesty*, and so not *Jure Divino*, as you have thus frequently cracked and boasted to the world; so as you must either now forthwith renounce your Bishopricks according to your Protestations, or else be guilty of breach of promise; unless you can prove you enjoy them only by a divine right, and yet only in, by, from &

* See my Breviate of the Bishops intolerable usurpations on the Kings Prerogative Royal Subjects lebirties. Prined 1635

† Mat. 22. 20. 21. Sir John Davis his Irish reports, p. 97, 98 a 26. Hen. 8. c. 1. 37. H. 8. c. 17. 1 Ed. 6. c. 2. 1 Eli. c. 1. 5. El. c. 1. 8. Eliz. c. 1

* In case they have any Charters or Commission under his Majesties Seale which all of them now want, and so

are meer usurpers on his Majesties Crown and Ecclesiasticall Prerogative, in keeping Consistories, Visitations, and Exercising Episcopal Jurisdiction in their own names, without any Patent or commission from the King.

under

under his Majesty, as *Supream head and Governour upon earth of the Church of* England, which is a contradiction.

If your Lordships, to maintain your divine pretended Episcopal Jurisdiction shall flie to (b) *Doctor John Pocklington* for ayd, who (by † *one of your Domestick Chaplains* approbation) hath lately published in print, *That you by Gods mercy to our Church, are able lineally to set down your Succession in your Episcopal dignity from St.* Peters *Chair at* Rome, *to St.* Gregory, *and from him, from our first Archbishop S.* Augustine, (though we had some (d) *Archbishops before his coming*, if our Historians truly inform us) *our English Apostle* (as the *Papists would have him styled*; though † *Bishop* Jewel, (f) Fox, *and* (g) *others*, renounce him) *downward to his Grace that now sits in his Chair, Primate and Metropolitan of all* England. I shall then desire your Lordships and this Doctor to prove, and resolve these questions.

First, Whether S. *Peter* was a real Bishop by Divine Institution?

Secondly, Whether he was ever a real Bishop of *Rome*? of which this *Doctor* is so impatient that he breaks out into (h) these passionate words well worthy your Episcopal Censure: *Whereby their vanity may appear, that upon idle ghesses against all antiquity, make fools believe, that S.* Peter *was* (k) *never at* Rome; *making the Succession of Bishops and truth of the Latine Churches, as questionable as the Centurists Orders.*

Thirdly, Whether *Peter* was * sole Bishop of *Rome*, or rather *Paul* also Bishop as well as he, yea both of them joint Bishops of *Rome* at the same time, and that by divine Institution*? If so, thence it will follow, that there ought to be † two Bishops of *Rome* (and so of *Canterbury*) at the same time, not one alone, or two several persons at least to constitute one Bishop.

Fourthly, Whether it will follow from *Peters* being Bishop of *Rome*, *Jure Divino*, that the Arch-bishops of *Canterbury*

b *Sunday no Sabbath*, p. 2. & 24.
† W. Bray.
d *See* Antiquit. Eccles. Brit. Goodwins Conversion of Brittanie. Bishop Usher *de Brittan. Ecclesiarum Primordiis. with others who write of King* Lucius, *and* Speeds *History, book* 6. p. 73. to 82.
* *Defence of the Apolog.* part 5. c. 1. Divis. 1., *Reply to* Harding, Artic. 1. Divis. 24.
f *Acts and Monuments*, vol. 2. p. 95. to 120.
g Speeds Hist. l. 6. c. 9.
h Page 43.
† *See Quest. Object. 6. Answ. 2. and most of our learned Writers, who have affirmed, that* Peter *was never at* Rome, *much lesse Bishop there, upon such grounds as this Doctor cannot answer.*
k Epiphanius contr. Hæreses, l. 1. Hær. 27. Col. 88, 89. Eusebius Eccl. Hist. l. 3. c. 21. Irenæus l. 3. c. 3, 4, 5. *write that both of them were Bishops of* Rome *at once, and not* Peter *the sole Bishop, and* Eusebius *puts* Paul *in the first place before* Peter.

and

and *York* must necessarily be Archbishops *jure Divino*? since all Protestants deny his pretended Successors of *Rome* to be so?

Fifthly, Whether if this Doctrine be true, this proposition can be denied; That your Lordships being lineally descended from the Church and Popes of *Rome* as Archbishops, are both the true and genuine Sons and Members of these two ghostly Parents? If you deny this inference, then you must renounce this divine Title to your Prelacies; if you subscribe unto it (as I presume you dare not) then all his Majesties subjects) who have in their (m) *oaths of allegiance and supremacy, renounced all foraign Jurisdictions with the Bishops and Church of* Rome, *abandoned by* * *several Acts of Parliament,*) must renounce both you, and this your Episcopal Jurisdiction too, thus claimed: which since you can no ways substantially prove to be *Jure Divino*, I hope you will now lay down your Bishopricks according to promise, (that his Majesty may enjoy their Temporalities) or else be thought never worthy faith or credit more in future time.

(m) 28 H. 8. c. 10. 1 Eliz. c. 1.
* See Rastall, Tit. Rome. 3 Jac. c. 4.

Neither may the seeming strangeness of the thing it self, deter you from it, this being no new thing amongst us, for Bishops not only to refuse, but to resign and give over their Bishopricks. For which I shall present you with variety of presidents; It is recorded of * *Ammonius, that when the Clergy and people Elected him for their Bishop, and urged him to take a Bishoprick upon him, he fled away secretly and cut off his right ear, that the deformity of his body might be a Canonical impediment to his election; and being yet deemed meet to be a Bishop by* Timotheus *the Patriark, though his Nose and his ears had been both cut off, by reason of his great learning and vertues; and the people drawing him against his will to accept that office, he replyed, that he would likewise cut off his tongue too, which pleased them, unless they would let him go & not make him a Bishop.* † Euagrius *the Philosopher, when he was constrained to accept a Bishoprick by* Theophilus Alexandrinus, *renounced his Ministry rather then he would accept it, such a dangerous office did he then repute it, and many good men else*; who as *Nicephorus* records, *refused anciently to accept thereof*, though nothing so dangerous and pernicious an office then, as now. *Nicephorus* * *Blemides, being*

* Tripartita, Hist. l. 8. c. 1. Sozomen, l. 7. c. 30. Socr. Scholast. l. 4. c. 18. *in the greek*, 23. Niceph. Eccles. Hist. l. 11. c. 37. Petrus Blesensis, Epist. 23.
† Socrat. Eccl. Hist. l. 4. c. 18. Niceph. l. 11. c. 37.
* Nicephori Gregoræ Hist. Rom. l. 3. c. 1, 2. f. 9. Cent. Magd. 13. Col. 582.

ing elected Patriarch of Constantinople, *absolutely* refused to accept it upon any terms: (u) Werinbaldus *unanimously elected Bishop of* Spires, *could by no means be induced to embrace it*: * Theophilus, *Archdeacon of* Adana, *being chosen Bishop of that See, refused to receive it, and being forced both by the Ministers and people to take it against his will, relinquished it shortly after though in an idle manner.* * Clement, *the first Pope of* Rome, *Pope* * Cornelius, Amb. ose,* Augustine, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen *his father, Pope* Gregory *the first*, Alexander *Patriarch of* Jerusalem, Anatolius *Bishop of* Laodicea, Eustathius, *Bishop of* Antioch, Antiochus, Theophilus Alexandrinus, Dioscorus, Chrysanthus, *S.* Martin *Bishop of* Towers, *S.* Nicholas, Paulinus *of* Nola, Eusebius Pamphilus, Flavianus *of* Antioch, Marchus, in ancient times were *all inforced to accept of their Bishopricks full sore against their wills and judgements, by the over-pressing importunity of other Bishops, Princes, Ministers and the people*, with others quoted to my hand by a *Claudius Espencæus*: b Eucherius *Bishop of* Lions, *and* Otho, *Bishop of* Bamburg, *were enforced in the same manner to be Bishops, very much against their liking, as was* c Cranmer *Archbishop of* Canterbury. d Ephræm, Syrus, Nilammon, Dracontius, Aetius *and S.* Bernard, *all constantly refused divers great and wealthy Bishopricks, not only offered to, but urged on them with much importunity*; so e Adrian *refused the Arbishoprick of* Canterbury, though called to it, and urged to accept it: Bassianus *being elected Bishop of the* Vangensi, f *furious* Memnon *whipped him before the Altar for three hours space, till he bedewed the Altar and New Testament with his bloud, because he refused to accept that Episcopal Charge and Office* g Bruno Segninas *rejected a Bishoprick offered to him, saying, A Bishoprick must be altogether forsaken of that man who would not be set at Christs left hand*; (answerable whereunto is that of h *Pope* Marcellus *the* 2. who *smiting his hand upon the Table*, used these words: *I do not see how those that possess this high place can be saved.*) i John Bugenhagius, *of late times repudiated the Bishoprick of* Camine *in* Pomerland, *to which he was freely chosen.*

a Trithemius, Cent. Magd. 10. Col 599.
* Cent. Magd. 6. Col. 644.
* Platina *and others in their lives.* Cyprian Epist. l. 4. Ep. 2.
* Possidonius in vita August. c. 4, 8, 15.
* Epist. 148, 203. Eusebius Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 9. l. 7. c. 29. Nicephorus Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 9, 10. l. 6. c. 16. l. 13. c. 10. l. 19. c. 13. l. 11. c. 32. Theodoret l. 1. c. 7 l. 4 c. 15. l. 5. c. 23. l. 2. c. 19. Nicephorus l. 9. c 16, 17.
a Digres. lib. 3. in 1 Tim. c. 4, 5, 6, 7.
b Cent. Magd. 3 Col. 1335. Cent. 10. Col. 1542: see Cent. 13. Col. 1098.
c Fox Acts and Monuments, p. 1703.
d Espenceus Digress. in 1 Tim. l. 3. c. 4, 5, 6, 7.

Sozomen, l. 8. c. 19. Tripartita Hist. l. 10 c. 11. 4. Nicephorus, l. 13. c. 14. e Godwins Catalo. p. 91. f Centur. Mag. 3 Col. 1043. g Cent. 10. c. 10. in his life. h Onuphrius and others in his life. i Chytræus Chron. Saxoniæ l. 1. p. 10.

From

From these and other Examples, most Bishops at their respective Ordinations, though they greedily post and hunt after Bishopricks, and oft times purchase them by * *Simoniacall contracts*, more for their rich Lordly Temporalities and Palaces, then the Spiritual Offices which God requires at their hands; *to wit*, diligent, frequent preaching of the Gospel, Administration of the Sacraments, Fasting, Almes and Prayer, do yet for custom and fashion sake when they are to be Ordained Bishops, with an *hypocritical modesty*, and a fictitious doubled * *Nolo, Nolo*, to this Interrogation, *Vis Episcopari?* seem utterly to refuse the Office, as *dangerous* to undertake, till pressed to accept it by a third demand, to which they give their cordial *Volo, Volo*.

* *Mat. Westminster, Ann.* 666, 958, 1038, 1074, 1694.

Prob dolor! Ecclesiæ nummis venduntur et æri, Res nimis iniusta, nummis fit Præsul et Abba.

* See *Pontif. Romanum.*

a For Bishops renouncing their Bishopricks; you may finde * *Narcissus* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, about the year of Christ 200. forsaking his Bishoprick for many years to lead a Philosophical retired life in the Wilderness: *Basilides* a Bishop in *Spain*, who about 230 years after Christ falling into heresie and blasphemy, and then into sickness, confessed his sins, and voluntarily surrendred his Bishoprick out of conscience: *Episcopatum pro conscientiæ suæ vulnere sponte deponens*, whereupon the people elected another in his place: So b *Gregory Nazianzen*, c *Hierax*, d *John* Bishop of *Antioch*, out of *conscience, and for quietness sake*, renounced and *repudiated their Bishopricks, betaking themselves to a more retired private life, wherein they might serve God better:* (1) *Gregory Nazianzen* using these memorable words to the people and Clergy of *Constantinople*, at the resignation of his Bishoprick. *If in any thing I have been an occasion of discord to you, I am not more venerable then the Prophet* Jonah, *cast me into the Sea, that the storm of tumults may cease far from you, I desire to suffer whatsoever you will (though I may be free from crimes) for your concord: DEJECT ME FROM (the Episcopal) THRONE, expell me the City, only (as the Prophet* Zachary *saith) love Truth and Peace, Dei jacturam non fecerint, QUI THRONO CESSERINT, sed supremam quæ his longe sublimior & securior est CATHEDRAM HABEBUNT*: with many other excellent passages to this purpose over-tedious to insert.

* Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. l. 3, 6. c. 10. Cent. Magd. 3. Col. 135, 163.

a Cyprian, Epist. 68. edit. Pamelii.

b Oratio ad 150 Episcopos Socrat. Eccles. hist. Hist. l. 5. c. 7. Vita ejus operibus præfixa.

c Isidor. Pelusiota. l. 3. Epist. 223.

d Nicephorus, Eccles. hist. l. 10. c. 11.

(1) Vita ejus operibus præfix. Oratio 32. & Epist. 59.

(2) Theodorus lector, collect. in. l. 1. Nicephorus, l. 15. c. 8. Espencæus in 1 Tim. Digression. l. 3. c. 18. p. 362.

(1) Centur. Magd. 4. col. 1175.

(2) Nicephorus Eccles. Hist. l. 15. c. 28. Centur. Mag. 5. col. 588.

(3) Theodor. lector. collar. l. 2. Davidis Hendelli Apolog. in sentent. Hieron. p. 195.

(4) Euagrius, l. 4. c. 4, 5. Centur. Magd. 6. Col. 637.

(5) Vincentius Spec. Hist. l. 21. c. 121. Cent. Magd. 6. Col. 747.

(6) Centur. Magd. 7. Col. 496. Vitellius artic. 2. col. 166.

(7) Hevigeri ecl. c. 40.

(2) *Martyrius* Bishop of *Antioch* under *Zeno* the Emperor, when he could not perswade the people to change their opinion, being divided into Sects by *Peter Gnapho* an Arch-heretick, using these words in a publick Sermon: *Clero rebelli, populo inobedienti, Ecclesiæ contaminatæ nuntium remitto, Sacerdotalem mihi reservans dignitatem*; which uttered, he laid down his Bishoprick and departed thence. To these I shall adde the memorable presidents of (1) *Justus* Bishop of *Lyons*, *Anno Dom.* 381. (2) *Martirius* Bishop of *Antioch*, *An* 471. (3) *Thaumastus* Bishop of *Mentz* about the same time, (4) *Paul* Bishop of *Antioch*, (5) *Maglorius* Bishop of *Dole An.* 610. (6) *Remaclus Trajectensium Episcopus*, *Anno* 654. † *Arsenius*, *Germanus*, *Paulus Cyprius*, *Josephus*, *Becus*, *Gregorius Cyprius*, *Athanasius*, *John*, *Joannes Glicis*, *Antonius Studites*, *Cosmas* and *Theodosius*, all Patriarks of *Constantinople*: as likewise of * *Gildenutus* Bishop of *Malden*, *Ulfranius* Bishop of *Sennes*, *Arnulph* Bishop of *Metz*, *Anno* 640. *Ado* Bishop of *Lyons*, *Victerbus* Bishop of *Ratisbon*, *Herigerus* Bishop of *Mentz*, *Michael* Bishop of *Ephesus*, *Adelbertus* Bishop of *Wortenburg*, *Michael Opites* Patriarch of *Athens*, *Desiderius* Bishop of *Flaunders*, *Bruno* the third, Bishop of *Colen*, *Ulricus* the second Bishop of *Constance*, *Walther* Bishop of *Augusta*, *Gerbardus* Bishop of *Herbipolis*, *Ulricus* Bishop of *Rhesia*, *Brincingus* Bishop of *Hildesheim*, *Conrade* the second Bishop of *Lubeck*, *Adam* Bishop of *Morini* in *Flaunders*, *Christianus* the second Bishop of *Marcke*, *Sebotho* Bishop of *Augusta*, *Everhardus* Bishop of *Rhemes*, *Ulricus* Bishop of *Salsburg*, *Conradus* Bishop of *Hieldesheim*, *Conradus* Bishop of *Halberstat*, *Ludolphus* Bishop of the same See, *Gunterus* Bishop of *Magdeburge*, *Josias Odolphus* Archbishop of *Upsal* in *Swethland*, * Pope *Celestine* the fifth,

Cent. Magd. 7. Col. 501. Niceph. Greg. Hist. Rom. l. 4. 2. 1. f. 12, 13, 14. *l.* 5. fol. 16. l. 6. f. 20, 21, 22, 24. l. 7. f. 29. l. 8. f. 31. Cent. Magd. 8. Col. 669. 672. Cent. 11. Col. 516. 518. Cent. 12. Col. 1384. Cent. 13. Col. 932. 983. * *Vincentius* Spec. Hist. l. 24 c. 25. Cent. Magd. 7. Col. 502. 507, 508. Cent. 8. Col. 763. 786. Cent. 10. Col. 586. Cent. 11. Col. 515. 576. Cent. 82. col. 1387. 1458. 1468. 1484. 1486. 1491. 1519. 1530. 1544. Cent. 13. col. 1042. 1052. 1057. 1062. 1078. 1092. 1093, 1094. 1102. 1146. * *Onuphrius*, *Platina*, others in his life. *Surius Concil.* Tom. 1. p. 608, 609.

1. *Athanasius*,

Athanasius Bishop of the *Pareni*, *Eustathius* Bishop of *Pamphilia*, *Rusticus* Bishop of *Narbon*, *Remaclus* Bishop of *Utrech*, *Orgerus* Bishop of *Spires*, *Lambert* Bishop of *Florence*, *Lhulphus* Bishop of *Challons*, *Hugh* Bishop of *Towres*, *Burchardus* Bishop of *Wertzberge*, *Michael Ephesinus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Desiderius* Bishop of the *Morini*, *Geoffry* Bishop of *Silvanecta*, *Conrade* Bishop of *Batavia*, *Albertus Magnus* Bishop of *Ratisbone*, of ancient times: With *Lewis ab Eberstein*, *Bartholomew Suavenius* and *John Frederick*, Bishops of *Camene* in *Pomerland*, *Isaurus* Archbishop of *Riga*, *Baldaser* Bishop of *Suerin*, *Ericus*, *John* Duke of *Saxony* and *Otto* Bishops of *Hildesheim*, *Hugh* the 47th Bishop of *Constance*, *Frederick a Weda* and *Salentine* Archbishops of *Colen*, *Augustus* Bishop of *Mersburge*, *Jodocus* a Reke Bishop of *Derbat*, *Francis*, *Henry* and *Julius* Bishops of *Minda*, *Theodosius* a *Rheden* Bishop of *Lubeck*, *Christopher* Bishop of *Raceburge*, *Christopher* Bishop of *Breme*, of later times beyond the Seas, with sundry other Patriarks, Archbishops and Bishops, * *many of them by reason of age or sickness, others out of discontent, others out of a desire of peace, quietness and ease from unnecessary cares and troubles; and others to lead a Monastical life free from the cares and troubles of the world; others of them meerly out of conscience of the unlawfulness, danger, hurt, and sins accompanying the very office of Bishops as then it is, and yet is used*; have voluntarily renounced, resigned, relinquished their Patriarkships, Archbishopricks, Bishopricks, and betook themselves to a more retired, religious, quiet, private, godly life, wherein they might serve God better, and shun those manifold occasions of evil and temptations, their Bishopricks would expose them unto, to the hazard of their Souls.

If these many foraign examples, will no wayes move your Lordships to give over your Bishopricks, as seeming over strange, we have many pregnant Domestique presidents of like nature, which may perswade you to make good your promise, and induce you to an imitation of them.

For I finde that * *Robert Gometiensis*, S. *Edmund*, *Boniface*, * *Simon Langham* and *Robert Kilwarby*, Archbishops of *Canterbury*; *Richard Beaveyes*, and *William de sancta Maria*, Bishops of *London*, *John Bokingham*, and *Philip Ripingdon* Bishops of *Lincoln*,

l Cent. Magd. 5. col. 998. 1035. 1056. Cent. 7. col. 496. cent. 8. col. 807. cent. 10, col. 598. cent. 11. col. 515. 546, 547. cent. 12. col. 1447. 1451. 1458. cent. 13. col. 1039. 1097. 1072. *Crantzii Metropol.*

* See *Claudius Espencæus* Digression. in 1 Tim. l. 3. c. 9, 10, 12, 13, to 21.

Bartholomæus Bishop of *Land.* Anno 1150.

* See *Gratian.* causa 7. qu. 1.

* *Godwins* Catalogue of Bishops *London*, 1615. p. 70, 113, 118, 120, 188, 192, 219, 303, 306, 313, 314, 318, 323, 336, 353, 397, 413, 414, 437, 438, 446, 447, 448, 456, 460, 477, 487, 500, 508, 532, 536, 543, 559, 564, 565, 567, 581, 585, 596, 629, 631, 932, 635, 636, 654, 655, 675, 676.

" *Lincoln*, *Richard Peche*, *Wineired* and *Roger de Weſeham* Biſhops
" of *Coventry* and *Lichfield*, *Hermane* Biſhop of *Sherborn*, *Shax-*
" *tone* Biſhop of *Saliſbury*, *William Warweſt*, *John Voyſy* and
" *Miles Coverdale* (who being deprived in Queen *Maries* time,
" cared not to return to his Biſhoprick in Queen *Elizabeths*,
" ſetling himſelf in *London*, and there leading a private life as
" an ordinary Miniſter) Biſhops of *Exceter*; *John Carpenter* and
" Maſter *Hugh Latimer* Biſhops of *Worceſter* (the later of whom
† *Fox* Acts and Monuments, p. 1578. and 4 Sermons before King *Edward*.
" † skipped for joy when he had caſt off his Rochet, for that
" he was eaſed of ſo heavy a burthen, and bleſſed God that he
" had given him grace to make himſelf a *Quondam* Biſhop;)
" *Ralfe de Maydeſtone* and *Thomas Spoffurd* Biſhops of *Hereford*,
" *Putta Quickhelmus* and *Haymo* Biſhops of *Rocheſter*, (the firſt
" of them becoming a Schoolmaſter, ſpent the reſidue of his
" dayes in that kinde of life, and could never abide to hear of
" returning to his Biſhoprick;) *Daniel* the ſixt, and *Frithſtane*
" the 23d, Biſhops of *Winchester*, *Robert Sherborne* Biſhop of *Chi-*
" *cheſter*, *Dubricius* Biſhop of *Carleon*, *Sulghein* Biſhop of S. *Da-*
" *vids*, *John Hunden* Biſhop of *Landaff*, *Caducanus* Biſhop of
" *Bangor*, *Geoffry* and *Elguenſis* Biſhops of S. *Aſaph*, *Colman*, S.
" *Cuthbert*, *Egelric* & *Nicholas de Furnham*, Biſhops of *Lindesfarne*
" and *Durham*; (the later of whom firſt of all twice refuſed, and
" then at laſt reſigned his Biſhoprick out of conſcience) *Pauli-*
" *nus de Leedes* (who peremptorily refuſed out of conſcience to
" accept the Biſhoprick of *Carlile*, though thereunto elected,
" and earneſtly intreated by King *Henry* the 2d to accept the
" place, who offered him 300 Marks yearly revenue for the
" increaſe of his living there, as did *Silveſter de Everdon* refuſe it
" for a time too) *Walter Malclerke* Biſhop of *Carlile*; *Cedda*, *Cœna*
" alias *Albert*, *John*, *Athelwold*, *Thurſtan*, *William Wickwane*, Arch-
* As did *Ceolnucus*, 2 Biſhop of *Lichfield*, *Mat. Weſt.* An. 656.
" biſhops of *York*, who all voluntarily, (moſt out of * conſci-
" ence, ſome out of choler, others for their eaſe, ſome for their
" age, others for other cauſes beſt known to themſelves) re-
" ſigned theſe their reſpective Archbiſhopricks and Biſhop-
" ricks, being ſo many domeſtick preſidents *to your Lordſhips*
(who have long ſince given over the main part of your Epiſcopal
function, Preaching,) now to do the like, according to your joint and
ſeveral Promiſes, in caſe you cannot prove your Archiepiſcopal and
Epiſcopal Juriſdictions Jure Divino, *and give a ſatisfactory Anſwer*

to these few pages, which I presume you can never do, since not only t *Hierom*, u *Ambrose*, x *Chrysostom*, y *Augustine*, z *Sedulius*, *Remigius*, *Primasius*, *Theodoret*, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Theophilact*, a *Isidor Hispalensis*, b *Alcuinus*, c *Oecumenius*, d *Gratian*, the "Councils of *Carthage* 4 Can. 22 to 26. of *Aquisgran*, c. 8. 10. "11. e *Juo Carnotensis*, f *Peter Lombard*, g *Bruno* and h other ancients, but even *Anselm* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Richard* Archbishop of *Ardmagh*, all the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy of *England* in 37 *H.* 8. in their Institution of a Christian man, Chapter of Orders, subscribed with all their names, "*Stokesley* Bishop of *London*, *Tonstall* Bishop of *Durham*, *Reginald Peacock* Bishop of *Chichester*, Bishop *Hooper*, Bishop *Latimer*, Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Alley*, but even Archbishop *Whitgift* himself, and Bishop *Bridges*, to omit *Wickliff*, *Swinderby*, *Walter Brute*, Sir *John Oldcastile*, Master *John Lambert*, Master *John Bradford*, and other our Martyrs. Master *Thomas Beacon*, Master *John Fox*. Master *Alexander Nowel*, Doctor *Whitaker*, Doctor *Humfry*, Doctor *Willet*, Doctor *Ayray*, Doctor *Taylor*, Doctor *Ames*, Doctor *Raynolds*, Doctor *Fulke*, and "others in * their authorized writings Printed here in *England*, *cum privilegio* and publick allowance; with the forecited Statutes of our Realm, and all the Bishops Patents in "the Reign of King *Edward* the 6th, *in expresse terms* conclude "your Archiepiscopal, and Episcopal Jurisdiction too, over "other Ministers, to be a meer humane invention long after "the Apostles time, to prevent, (*or rather as the event hath ever "since proved, to engender, foment and occasion*) all schisms, factions, "errors and disorders in the Church; when as k Christ himself, "and l his Apostles since, ordained a Parity, an equality both "among his Apostles and Ministers, (whom all these assert to "be one and the same with Bishops in order and degree, by "divine right) m and ever instituted many Bishops over every "particular Church, but never any one Bishop or Minister "over many, as the best means to preserve unity, and root

t *Epist.* 2. 83. 85. *in Tit.* 1. *Phil.* 1. *and* 1. *Tim.* 3.
u *In Eph.* 4. *and* 1 *Tim.* 3.
x *Hom.* 1. *in Phil.* 1. *Hom.* 11. *in* 1 *Tim.* 3 *Hom.* 2. *in Tit.* 1.
y *Ep.* 19. 83. 85. *Quæst. ex utrisq; mixtim.* 100, 101.
z *In Phil.* 1.
a 1 *Tit.* 1. 5. 7. 1 *Tim.* c. 3. & 4. *Acts* 15. & 20. 17. 28.
b *Ori. l.* 7. *c.* 12. *l.* 8. *Eccl. Officiis, l.* 2. *c.* 7.
c *De divinis officiis, l.* 2 *c.* 35, 36. *In Acts* 15. & 20. 1 *Tim.* 3. *Phil.* 1. 1 *Tit.* 1. 5. 7.
d *Distinct.* 80. 93. *Causa* 2. *Qu.* 7.
e *Decretal. part.* 5. *c.* 58, 59, 72. 107. 143. 144.
f *Sent. l.* 4. *Distinct.* 14.
g *in Phil.* 1. *Tit.* 1. & 1 *Tim.* 3.

h *Ambrosius Fortunatus de Eccles. Officiis, l.* 2. *c.* 13. *Basilius Magnus in c.* 3. *Isaac. Nazianzen. Orat.* 9. 13. 15. 21. 18. * *Quoted by* Gersomus Bucerus, *the Petition to Queen* Elizabeth, *Master* Parker, *and Doctor* Bastwicks *Flagellum & Apologia.* k *Matth.* 20. 20. *to* 29. *Mark* 10. 35. *to* 48. *Luke* 22. 23. *to* 28. l 2 *Pet.* 5. 1. *to* 6. *Acts* 14. 23. *c.* 20. 17. 28. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 5. 7. 1 *Tim.* 3. *&c. c.* 5. 17. *c.* 4. 14. *Jam.* 5. 14. m *See Bishop* Jewels *Defence of the Apologie, part* 2. *c.* 3. *Divis.* 5. *an excellent place for this purpose.*

"out schisms, occasioned only by the pride, ambition, cove-
"tousnes, power and tyranny of domineering Prelates and
"Clergy-men.

Thus craving pardon for my boldness in pressing your Lordships like two honest plain-dealing men, to make good your words, that so we may once again become fellow brethren, and walk hand in hand together like equals, without that infinite Lordly distance, which is now between, not only your Lordships and ordinary Ministers, but the chiefest Nobility, Judges, Justices and Gentry of this Realm, (now slighted, awed, vilified, oppressed by your Lordly power:) I take my leave, and rest

Your Lordships faithfull Monitor,

W. P.

A Brief Exhortation to the Archbishops and Bishops of England, *in respect of the present Pestilence*, Anno Dom. 1636.

MY LORDS, (for so you stile [a] *your selves*, and will be intituled by all men, notwithstanding the [b] *Lords own inhibition to the contrary*,) the Prophet *Isay* c. 26. 9. hath informed me, *That when Gods Judgments are on the Earth, the Inhabitants of the world will learn righteousnes*: and who knows whether your Lordships, (as properly *inhabitants*, if not servants and lovers too, *of the World*, as any of whatever profession, *though you c should not be so*) may not now in this time of Pestilence, when Gods Judgments are every where so rife among us, *learn righteousnes* as well as others, (if you think not your selves too wise to learn, and too old to be instructed) if any man will but take the pains to teach you.

Hearken therefore, I beseech you, as you tender either the preservation of your lives, in this time of Mortality, or the salvation of your souls in the great day of Judgement, or the lives and souls of his Majesties Subjects committed to your Charge, to a short Lecture (no ways overburthensome to your memories) which I shall here read unto you for your good, if you

a *Bishop* Whites *Title to his Treatise of the Sabbath day.*

b *Math.* 23.8,9. 10, 11. c. 20. 25, 26. *Jam.* 3. 1. 1 *Pet.* 5. 3.

c 1 *Jo.* 2. 15, 16, 17. *Jo.* 17. 14, 15, 16. *Mat.* 6. 24. 2 *Tim.* 4. 10.

Si mundum prædicas contemnendum, contemne tu prius. Bernard Serm. in Concil. Rhemensi.

pleaſe either ſo to interpret it, or come with a ſincere conſcience for to hear it. It may be that in regard of your ſacred Epiſcopal Order, you conceit your ſelves altogether *plague-free*, and as wholly exempt from divine, as you do ſtrive to be from *temporal Juriſdiction*; (which makes you neither to dread the plague, which hath ſeized upon † *ſundry Kings and laid them in the duſt*) nor as yet any way to endeavour by faſting and prayer to prevent either it, or that famine likely to accompany it. But to inſtruct you how you are ſtill but men (and ſo expoſed to all thoſe mortal ſickneſſes which continually aſſault the crazy fortreſſes of our [d] *earthly Tabernacles*, *Non obſtante* your Rochets, Miters, Croſiers, and all other your Epiſcopal harneſs,) give me leav in a word or two to acquaint you, *That* † Pelagius *the ſecond* (though a Pope, and *Biſhop of Rome*) notwithſtanding his Pontifical Robes, Exorciſms, Pomp, and Charms, *was both ſeized upon and devoured by this impartial diſeaſe*, An. Dom. 591. as *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, *Anaſtatius*, *Stella*, *Faſciculus Temporum*, *Balæus*, *Luitprandius*, *Vitelius*, and others teſtifie in his life: *Which Plague* (as (e) *Petrus Bleſenſis*, *Archdeacon of Bath* records) *was ſent by God as a juſt Judgment upon the Romans and Italians*, *for giving themſelves to drinking*, *feaſting*, DAUNCING, *ſports and paſtimes*, *even on Eaſter day and other following holy dayes*, *after their participation of the bleſſed Sacrament of Chriſts body and blood* (*many of them being conſumed and dying of the Plague*, *in the very midſt of their ſports*, *mirth*, *ales and paſtimes*) *and on this Pope himſelf*, *for not reſtraining them from this prophaneneſs*; A preſident which ſhould make your Lordſhips fear and tremble, this preſent *Plague* beginning here on Eaſter-week laſt, as that Plague then did, no doubt for the ſelf-ſame prophanation of God's own day and Sacraments, with thoſe abuſes, ſports, paſtimes, ſins, for which they then were plagued; which your Lordſhips have not only not reſtrained but countenanced, patronized, yea propagated all you could, this Pope going not ſo far. That * *Cantinus* Biſhop of *Auvernium*, *Cato* his Succeſſor in the ſame See, *Rupertus* Biſhop of *Triers*, *Hermannus* Biſh. of *Verdunum*, *Rainold* Biſhop of *Colen*, *Conrade* Biſhop of *Auguſta*, *Walricus* Biſhop of *Spiers*, *Ruggerus* Biſhop of *Herbipolis*, and *Sigfridus* of the ſame, *Eberhardus* Biſhop

Theodoſius the ſecond an Emperour and ſundry Kings, as *Kinredus*, *Offa*, (whom *Platina* in the life of Pope *Conſtantine* records to have both died of the Plague at *Rome* with many other Kings have died of the Plague.

[d] 2 *Cor.* 5. 1.

† *Matth. Weſtminſter An.* 591 p. 231.

[e] *Sermo.* 20. *in Letania majori* 1 Cor. 11.

* *Cent. Magd.* 6. *Col.* 7. 31. *Ibid.* 137. *Cent.* 10. *Col.* 475. *Cen.* 12. *Col.* 1454. *Ibid.* 1466. *Ibi.* 1488 *Ibid.* 1489. *Cent.* 12. *Col* 1492. *and* 1493. *Col.* 1512. 1533.

shop of Ratisbon, Gerion Bishop of Halberstat; all dyed of the plague. * In the great plague that happened in the Emperour Frederick Barbarossa his Army in Italy, many German Prelates and some German Princes which came with him, died of the Pestilence, neither their consecration nor their function being any antidote against this disease. In the great [f] Council of Basil, Anno 1431. (to name no more forraign examples) Lodovicus Patriarch of Aquilea, the Bishops of Ebron, Lubeck, Constance, and others died of the Plague; Æneas Silvius himself (afterwards Pope) being there stricken with this disease, whereof he lay three days together at the point of death, all men despairing of his life, but yet by Gods help he escaped.

If any of your Lordships should think these forraign presidents prove not, that any English Prelates are obnoxious to the self same disease; to rectifie this mistake, I shall present you with some domestick examples, worthy your most serious consideration. (g) Anno Dom. 664. on the 26 day of October, Ceadda the second Bishop of Litchfield, with all the Monks of his Monasterie at Lestinghen, were taken away with the Plague. The very next year following (h) Anno 665 Tuda, or Juba the fourth Bishop of Durham dyed of the Pestilence. Wigardus Arch-Bishop of Canterbury Elect, the same year, with most of his Followers died at Rome of the Plague. (i) Anno 1258. Fulco Basset the 45 Bishop of London, was smitten to death with the same fatal disease. (k) Michael Northbrook his Successor the 57 Bishop of London, Anno 1361. perished of the plague; and the same year, Reginald Briand Bishop of St. Davids, being translated to Ely, deceased of the Plague before his translation could be perfected. * Thomas Bradwarden Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, Anno 1348. dyed of the same disease. And to cite no *more in so plain a case, (l) Anno 1500. Thomas Langton Bishop of Winchester, then Arch-Bishop of Canterbury elect but not installed, and Thomas Rotheram Arch-Bishop of York, were both in the self same year swept away together with this pestilential disease.

These severall Presidents, with those of (a) Pope Lucius the second, and Pope Celestine the second, both taken away by the Plague within the compass of two years, The Bishops of Parma, Rhegium

* Grimstons Imperial History p. 490.

[f] Fox Acts and Monuments, p. 632.

g Mat. West. Godwins Catalogue of English Bishops pag. 183.

h Godwin Antiq. Eccles. Brit. p. 13. Godw. p. 53. 629.

i Godwin ibid. p. 195.

k Godwin ibid. p. 198. 444. * See Grafton. p. 123.

l Godwin ibid. p. 164. 344. 617 Antiquit. Eccles. Brit. p 345

m Stella, Platina, Fasciculus temporum, Centur. Mag. 12. col. 1 407.

b Rhegium, *and* Millain. *Anno* 1085. (*c*) Daniel *the* 13. *Bishop of* Prague Anno 1116. *the Bishop of* Marselles, *and all his Church. who dyed all of the Pestilence, anno.* 1348. to omit others, may be a good Memento and Monition to your Lordships (being Bishops and Arch-bishops) to put you in mind, both of your mortality in general (which most fear you seldom seriously consider of, being so overmuch taken up with * *secular imployments, the world not compatible with your spiritual functions,*) and that you, though Bishops, are subject to this disease and stroke of God as well as others, or these your Predecessors: and therefore should now at length, after so many weeks delay endeavour to appease Gods wrath, and cease this plague begun among us, (which every day spreads it self more and more) by publick fastings, prayer, preaching and humiliation, *the chief remedy*, not only (*m*) *prescribed in Scripture by God himself*, but likewise *by the whole Church and state of England in the two last great Plagues both in* 1 *Jacobi, and in the first year of our present Soveraigns Raigne, as the several Books of Common prayer and order of fasting, then published by these noble Princes special commands*, yet testifie on record: *both of these books joyntly confessing and bewayling, that among other sins occasioning these two dreadful man-eating Pests*, this was not the least, *That the* † SABBATH DAY *was not kept holy, but prophaned; and therefore no wonder that these Plagues break in upon us.*

b *Bertoldus Constantiensis ad Heruanarum appendix. Anno* 1085. p 357.

c *Georgius Pontanus Bohemiæ piæ l.* 3. *p.* 34.

d *Alberti Argentinensis Chron. Anno* 1348 *p.*147.

* *Nemo potest duobus Dominis servire, Deo & Mammonæ. Site curiæ, & maxime scaccarii labyrinthis immerseris, magna spiritualis exercitii dispendia patieris. Quid tibi ad Fiscales redditus, ut vel horula brevi curam posthabeas animarum? Nunquid Christus te ad Telonium elegit? Matthæus semel inde sumptus, denuo ad ipsum non reddit. Non sis ergo in turba eorum qui secularia spiritualibus ante ponunt glutientes camelum, culicem liquantes, &c. Petrus Blesensis De instit. Episc. Tractatus.* m Numb. 6. 25. 6. Joel 1 14. 15. 16. c. 2. 12. 13. 14. Isa. 2. 2. 12. 13. 14. Zeph. 2. 1. 2. † So 1 Iac. stiles it.

And may not your Lordships and the whole Kingdome justly fear, that this very sin of *Sabbath-breaking*, and prophaning Gods own sacred day by SPORTS, WAKES, MAY-GAMES, DAUNCING, drunkenness, chambering, wantonness, idleness, travelling, unnecessary labour, and the like, *which drew on these two former plagues upon us*, hath been one main cause of this present pest, which begins thus freshly

to destroy us? It being most apparent to our shame (and I fear to all our smart) that the Lords-day Sabbath (*for so our own* † a *Homilies stiled it before the troubles of Frankfort*, 1544. *when* b *Dr. Heylin, and before Dr. Bounds Books*, *An.* 1595. *when Doctor Pocklington fables that the Lords day was first anabaptized a Sabbath day and Christned with this name by some Jewish God-father, to overthrow the Liturgie and Discipline of the Church of* England; who yet freqently gave it this Title long before these ignorant Doctors dream, both in (*) *her Homilies* and approved writers works,) hath of late been more generally, publikely, audaciously prophaned in most places of the Realm by the fore-named Pastimes, abuses and disorders, then before those two sweeping plagues, not only in point of practise, which is ill; but even in point of Doctrine, which is worse; many late *authorized* c *Histories, Treatises, Discourses of the Sabbath*, not fearing publikely *to maintain the Lawfulness of dauncing-morrisees, may-games, dedication-Feasts, Pastimes, Sports and ordinary labour even on Gods own day, as the Doctrine of the Church of* England, when as acute Mr. *John* Sprint, *in his proposition for the Christian Sabbath day, Printed by License*, London, 1607. p. 4. (newly reprinted) and learned *Doctor* John White *in his* † *Way to the true Church five times printed by Authority* (yea *set forth and defended by Doctor* Francis White *now Bishop of* Ely) expresly brand it, *not only as a Papish and Heathenish practise; but likewise as a point of Popish Religion, which directly tends to the maintenance of open sin and liberty of life, and expresly allows most palpable wickedness, directly tending to the dissolution of publike government and private honesty: being that which hath made the Papists the most notorious Sabbath-breakers that live,* * Zanchius *and* † Musculus *also branding this very Doctrine of liberty they now teach and the practise of it, as Popish, and all the Bishops, Clergy, King, Lords, Commons and Parliament of* England *in King* Henry *the eighth his Raign, condemning it in two several Books, as meerly Jewish*; to check the dotage of those *Novel Doctors*, who now stile *the strict sanctification of the Lords day by abstinence from dauncing, sports, and pastimes, Judaizing*; when as that they plead for, is truly such.

This gross prophanation therefore of the Lords day both in Doctrine

† So the homili of the time and place of prayer and against d sobedience and wilful rebellion, part 3. *of the Sabbath a Hist. part.* 2. *c.* 8.

b *Sunday no Sabbath, p.* 6. 20. 21.

* *Of the time and place of Prayer. See Sunday a Sabbath.*

c *Bishop* Whit, *Doctor* Heylin. *Doctor* Pocklington, *Doctor* Primrose, Christopher Dow, Edmund Reeve *and others.*

† *Sect.* 38. *n.* 1. *p.* 111. *Digres.* 46. *Sect.* 43. *n.* 6. *p.* 165. 166.

* *In quartum Præceptum.*

† *In Joan. c.* 7.

* *Institution of a Christian man, and a Necessary Eruditio*, &c. *Exposition on the fourth Commandment.*

Doctrine and practise, *y aggravated with the late Inspending, silencing, excommunicating, Pursevanting, vexing, persecuting, depriving, crushing of many learned, painful, godly, conscionable Ministers, both against all the Rules of Canon Law, Common Law, Statute Law, conscience, reason, piety, charity, justice,* and the Presidents of all former ages, meerly for refusing out of conscience upon their Episcopal Mandates, to have any hand or finger in acting or proclaming any thing which might animate their people to this pestiferous sin, (punished within these three years with many memorable † particular judgments of God, immediately executed from Heaven;) hath no doubt so far provoked our most gracious God, that now he can hold *z off his hands no longer from smiting us,* with his dreadful judgments, which some of us have already felt, and most of us now fear: who questionless will never take off his Pests and Judgments from us, till your Lordships shal take off your most unjust suspensions and censures from those who have thus suffered in his quarrel, and all of us repented of this our crying sin of prophaning Gods own sacred day, both in point of Doctrine and practise: An abomination never more rife in any then this our present age, by reason of your Lordships patronizing, propagating and defending it, in such a publick, shameless, violent manner, as no former age can ever parallel, to Gods dishonour, your own eternal infamy, and the fitting of your selves, and this whole Kingdom for those publick judgments, not only of a late cold extraordinary winter, and two excessive dry summers, which threaten a famine of bread to recompence that * *famine of Gods word,* which you have lately caused, (to omit al other miseries which we suffer) but likewise of that plague which is now dispersed: In the pulling down whereof, as your Lordships have had, no doubt, a deeper hand then others, so you have great cause to fear, you shal feel the irrisistable mortiferous stroke thereof, as much or more then others. The Plague, you well know, *is Gods own arrow, Psal. 91. 5. who ordaineth his arrows against the Persecutors.* Psal. 7. 13. And are not some at least of your Lordships such? *It is Gods own hand,* 2 Sam. 24. 14. 15. Jer. 21. 6. *Now Gods hand shall find out all his enemies, his right hand shall find out those*

y 2 Chron. 36. 15. 16. 17. 1 Thes. 2. 14. 15. 16.

† *See a divine Tragedy lately acted.*

z Jer. 20. 19.

* Amos 8. 11.

that hate him, Psal. 21.8. And are not many of your Lordships in that number? It is *Gods own brandished Sword*, Psa. 8.6. And whom doth God *wound and slay therewith but the* † *head of his enemies, and the hairy scalp of those who go on still in their trespasses?* And are not too many of your Lordships such; who even now in the very midst of Gods judgments, proceed on still in your malicious, violent, implacable hatred, enmities, persecutions against Gods faithful Ministers, Saints and the very power of holiness, in your Lordly Pomp, ambition, avarice, Pride, envy, arrogance, cruelty, oppressions, injustice, luxury, secularity, suppression of preaching, prayer, fasting, communion of Saints, and whatever savours of Piety? in prophaning of Gods own sacred day, both in your Doctrine and practise; which is seldome worse solemnized, or more prophaned, as † Mr. *Bucer* long since observed, *Quam in ipsis Episcoporum aulis, then in Bishops own Palaces*, where neither Lord, nor Chaplain, nor servants, make any great conscience of prophaning it sundry ways, to give the better example of piety and holiness unto others. How then (being heavy laden with these many sins, and having the prayers, cries, clamors, tears, sighs, groans, of all Gods children against you, if not of the whole Kingdom too; the daily imprecations of many distressed Ministers, people, (whom you have most injuriously and inhumanely handled without any lawful cause,) can you but fear Gods vengeance and expect his plagues, to sweep such Clods of sin and mischief, such pests and prodigies as many of you are, clean away; [d] *Be wise now therefore, Oye Kings*, (for such are you now become by giving absolute Lawes, and prescribing what Ceremonies, Articles, Rites, Oaths, Novelties you please, even in your own names and rights alone, unto his Majesties people, and executing all Lordly, Kingly Soveraignty and dominion *over* * *mens bodies and estates as well as souls, contrary to our Lawes, and our Saviours expresse Inhibition*, Matt. 20.25.26.) *Be learned Oye Judges of the earth*, (for such are you now in many temporal Courts, as well as Ecclesiastical, and would be gladly such in more, instead of being *Preaching Bishops* in your *Pulpits*, and Pastors of mens souls:) *Serve the Lord in fear!* (for that is your duty, not to be Lords your selves, or reverenced

† Psal. 68.21. Deut. 32.41.

† In Psa. 92.

d Ps. 2.9.11. 12.

* *Animabus Præsus es, non corporibus, commune est nihil Prælato, cum* Pilato. Petrus Blesensis. *Tract. de Institut. Episcopi*, Joan. Wigornienſi *Episc. dicatus.*

renced and served with fear, as Lords are wont to be:) and *rejoyce unto him,* (not with Organes, Choristers, Pipes and Daunces, but) *with trembling: kiss the son* (whom you have hitherto buffeted, † *persecuted in his faithful Ministers and Servants*) *lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way, even now when his wrath is kindled but a little,* and his plagues but newly kindled; lest if ye refuse to turn from all your former sins and wickednesses, *he* begin at *last to bruise you with this his rod of Iron, and dash you in pieces like a Potters vessel,* * *and there be none to deliver you from this his raging fury.* Remember I beseech you that of the Prophet *Nahum,* (g) *God is jealous, and the Lord revengeth, the Lord revengeth, and is furious; the Lord will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.* And though he hath for a long time (h) *suffered you with much patience* (*as he doth other vessels of wrath fitted to destruction,*) to spoyle, oppresse and deal treacherously with his people; yet consider now, that the times are drawing near, wherein you may be recompensed with the like usage as the *Prophet Isaiah threatens.* † *Woe to thee that spoylest, and thou that wast not spoyled, and dealest Treacherously, and they deale not treacherously with thee: When thou shalt cease to spoile, thou shalt be spoiled; and when thou shalt make an end to deal treacherously, they shall deal treacherously with thee.* Wherefore my Lords (k) *break off your sins* and sinfull proceedings by sincere and timely *repentance,* and of *Lyons, Bears,* † *Wolves, Thieves, Robbers,* (which *many Bishops* have degenerated into) become * *Lambs and Shepherds to Gods people*; and now at last (m) *as the Elect of God, holy and beloved, put on bowels of mercies, kindnesse, humblenesse of mind, meeknesse, long-suffering, forbearing and forgiving all those against whom you have any quarrel, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.* And above all things, *put on Charity, which is the bond of perfectnesse, and let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to which you are also called in one body; and let the word of God dwell richly in you, in all wisdom,* &c. And if you will divert this Pest either from your selves or others, then presently † *begin to turn to the Lord with all your hearts, with fasting, weeping, and with mourning, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the Elders,* &c. (and

† Acts 9.4. 5.

* Psal. 7. 12.

g Nahum 1. 2.
h Rom. 9. 22.
† Isai. 33. 1. *Væ his qui præsident hominibus, nisi eis præsideat Deus.* Petrus Blesensis, *de Instit. Episcopi Tract. 1.*
k Dan. 4. 22.
† Acts 20. 27. Joh. 10. 1. 20. *Frequens est inter Episcopos aliquem invenire, qui primum suæ promotionis annum dedicet sanctitati, cumque in sua novitate sit factus agnus, inveteratus aliquot dierum, sit rapacissimus Lupus.* Petrus Blesensis, *De Instit. Episc. Tract.*
* Isa. 11. 6. 7.
m Col. 3. 12. 13 14. 15.
† Joel. 2. 12. 13. 14. 15. 14. 15. 16.

(and not by proxy but in proper person, if ever you will either be reputed the Priests or Ministers of the Lord,) *Weep between the Porch and the Altar, and say, Spare thy people O Lord, &c. give not thine heritage to reproach. Alas, for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come, and who shall escape it?* And that your fast may be acceptable, beware that it be not * *a fast for strife and debate, to smite with the fist of wickedness, or to make your voice to be heard on high; beware lest it be only a hanging down of your heads like a bull-rush, and afflicting of your souls only for a day: But let it be that true fast, which God hath chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to let the oppressed go free, to undo the heavy burthens* (which you have lately laid on Ministers and people) *and to break off every yoak,* (wherewith you like *Lordly* † *Barons have* clogged the Consciences, yea bodies, of Gods servants, and brought them into a miserable bondage and captivity under you, as if they were your vassals, not Brethren:) *to break your bread to the hungry, to bring the poor that are cast out,* (yea the poor Ministers and Christians you have most unchristianly cast out of their livings, houses and Gods house it self, and thrown into your nasty Prisons, where they must still be detained when others are set free,) *to your houses,* (yea to their own houses, livings, and Gods house again,) *to cloath the naked, to draw out your soul to the hungry, to satisfie the afflicted soul; to turn away your feet from doing your pleasure on Gods holy day; to call the Sabbath a delight; the holy of the Lord honourable; to honour God alone therein, not doing your own ways, not minding your own pleasure, not speaking your own words.*

* Isa. 58. 4. to 14.

† *Quidam Episcopi Regum munificentias & eleemosinas antiq orum, abusive Baronias & Regalia vocant. Et in occasionem turpissimæ servitutis & seipsos Barones appellant, vereor ne de illis queruletur Dominus, & dicet, Ipsi regnaverunt & non ex me. Principes exstiterunt & ego non cognovi. Scias te assumpsisse Pastoris Officium non Baronis. Certe* Joseph *in* Ægypto *patrem suum & fratres instruxit, ne dicerent* Pharaoni, *viri Pastores sumus: Maluit eos profiteri Pastoris officium, quam Principis aut Baronis.* Petrus Blesensis *Tractat. De Instit. Episcopi.*

o Zeph. 2. 3.

If thus you now fast and do (o) *peradventure you may be spared in the day of the Lords great wrath, and God will make our health to spring forth speedily*: But if you forbear to do it, and proceed on as you have done, be sure (p) *that God will visit you for these things, and that his soul shall be avenged on such a*

p Jer. 5. 9.

Nation

Nation as you are. He will no doubt (q) *bring evil upon you, which you shall not be able to escape, in this your both of yours and his visitation:* in which as you have most strangely visited others, thrusting many of Gods best and painfullest Ministers from their Ministeri, in sundry places, upon meer new fancies and Articles of your own, against all law and justice; so God the Supreme Visitor, will in his justice visit you, in one kinde or other, with his most righteous Judgments, and cut you off with his Plagues, as he hath done your forecited Predecessors, or with some other signal Judgments of like nature. This you have cause to fear, and seriously to expect, unless you forthwith become * *New Creatures.* Lo, I have in few words admonished you; If you amend, there may be hope of mercy, if you continue what ye are, contemn all admonitions, † *striving still as you have done, against God his truth and people, you shal be ashamed, confounded and perish, you shal become as nothing, and as a thing of nought: For God hath spoken it, and he* (ſ) *will make it good,* (t) *The Transgressors shal be destroyed together, the end of the wicked shal be cut off. For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be, thou shalt diligently consider their place, and it shal not be found.* (u) *Consider what I have written, and the Lord give you understanding in all things.*

q Jer. 11. 11. 23.

* 2 Cor. 9.

† Isa. 41. 11. 12.

ſ Numb. 23 10.

t Psa. 37. 10 38

u 2 Tim. 2. 7.

Farewell.

W. P.

To the Reader.

CHristian Reader, what that Oracle of Wisedom hath registred, *Proverb.* 13. 10. *Onely by Pride cometh Contention*; was never more really verified in any one particular, then in the Prelates whose ambitious windy tumor, and overswelling pride, as in all former ages, so in this, hath (a) *filled the whole Christian world with warres, civil dissensions, and the Church it self, with endless schismes, controversies, contentions, which else would never had existence.* The pretended primacy of the great pontifical Bishop of *Rome*, what tumults, battels, warres, treasons, rebellions, murders, martyrdomes, hath it ingendred on the one hand; what disputes, books of controversie and paper-battels, on the other? What innumerable Schisme Treatises, (which the undoubted parity of Ministers and Bishops *Jure Divino* had prevented) have the Prelates pretended superiority by divine institution, over Presbyters and their fellow Ministers, produced in all ages, Churches, especially in our own; (from the first glimmerings of the Gospel in *John Wiclifes* daies till now, more or less disquieted with this unhappy controversy?) which being raked up in ashes for a space, by reason of our Bishops waving of their divine right (which no

g *See Platina & Anastatius de vitis Pontificum. Theodoricus a Niem. Zabarel, & Joannis Marius de Schismate.*

Master Tyndals obedience of a Christian man; and practise of Popish prelates.

Doctor John White his Defence of the way, Chapter the sixth, the fifth homily against Disobedience and wilful rebellion. Fox Acts and Monuments throughout Catalogus Testium Veritatis.

one

only. Archbishop (b) *Anselme*, (c) *Richardus Armachanus*, and (d) Bishop *Peacock* of old, but likewise (e) Bishop *Tonstal*, Bishop *Stokesly*, (f) Bishop *Hooper*, (g) Bishop *Jewell*, (h) Bishop *Alley*, (i) Bishop *Pilkington*, yea (Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* himself, and (l) Bishop *Bridges*, our two late most learned Professors of Divinity, Doctor *John Reinolds* in his Letter to Sir *Francis Knols* for *Oxford*; and Doctor * *William Whitaker Regius Professor* of Divinity for *Cambridge*, to omit all others, have since them publikely disclaimed, (*confessing Bishops and Presbyters*, Jure Divino *to be all one, equal, and the same; and the difference that is between them to be only by custome, humane institution, and the grant of Princes, not by divine right*; and the Statutes of 37. H. 8. *c.* 17. 1. Ed 6. *c.* 2. 1. & 2. *Mariæ c.* 8. & 1. *Elizab. c.* 1. *have for ever judicially in ful Parliament) resolved against*;) yet our present ambitious Prelates studying to surmount their Predecessors, not onely in worldly pomp and power, derived from their indulgent Soveraign, but likewise in spiritual Jurisdiction, claime from God himself, (though many of them have neither time nor care to preach, pray, or do him any Episcopal Service, being wholly taken up with secular offices, and affairs, and † unable *to serve God for serving his incompatible enemies, Mammon and the world*,) have lately blown abroad the coals, and resuscitated the violent flames of this contention afresh, by a new ambitious claim of all their Episcopal Soveraignty and Jurisdiction, *Jure Divino*, not only in their Sermons and Books, but even *in the High Commission Court it selfe*, in the late censure of Doctor *Bastwick*, for a Book written *onely against the Pope and Italian Bishops*, without any reflexion upon them, as all men then conceived, and therefore wondred at, till their magnifying of the *Church of* (m) Rome *as a true Church in that Censure of his, and some late licensed Pamphlets*, their Antichristian Papal proceedings against Gods truth, Ministers, Ordinances, and the late authorizing of Doctor *Pocklingtons*

b *Com. in Phil.* 1. 1. *in Tit.* 1. 5. 7. *in* 1 *Tim.* 3. & 4.
c *De Quest. Armeniorum. l.* 11 *c.* 1. *to* 8.
d *Balæus Cent.* 8. *c.* 19.
e *Fox Acts Monuments, p.* 972. 973.
f *On the eighth Commandement.*
g *Defence of the Apologie. part.* 2. *c.* 3. *Divis.* 1. 5. *pag.* 85. 99. 100. 101: & *c.* 9. *Divis.* 1. *pag.* 196. 202.
h *Poor mans Library, part.* 1 *f.* 95. 96.
i *Exposition on Aggeus, vers.* 1. & 2.
k *Against Cartwright. p.* 389.
l *Of the Princes Supremacy, p.* 359.
* Contra Durum .l 6. sect. 1. Controv. 4. De Ecclesiæ Regimine qu. 1. cap. 1. sect. 1. 2. cap. 2. 1. l. p. 509.
† John 2. 15.

sect. 16. qu. 4. c. 3. sect. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. De Notis Ecclesiæ. qu. 5. Contr. 2. Concil. qu. 3. *c.* 2. p. 586. 587.
m See Chowneus Collect. Theol. and Shelford's 5 Treatises.

*Pag. 2. 43. 44. *Sunday no Sabbath*, *by the Arch-Bishop of* Canterbury's *own Chaplain*, *Master* Bray; which expressly avers, *That our Arch-Bishops and Bishops can, and do lineally derive their pedegree and Succession from* Peter *and the Popes of* Rome; *hath since instructed the ignorant people, that* Popes, Italian *and English Bishops, are in truth* * *all members of the same body, whelps of the same litter, branches of the same tree, and some of our present Prelates, the Pope of* Romes *own lineally descended sons*; so as they could not but be sensible of, and highly offended, if not actually lashed, wounded with their Fathers scourge; *Flagellum Pontificis & Episcoporum Latialium*, being a whip for them, as well as for the Italian Prelates.

* *See* Henry Stalbridge *his Exhortatory Epistle.* William Wraughton *his hunting of the Romish Fox.*

Roderick Mors *his Complaint*, c. 23. *Master* Tyndals *his obedience of a Christian man, and Practise of Popish Prelates.* Fox *Acts and Monuments*, *part* 414. 514. 516. 518. *Master* Whethenhall *his Discourse of the Corruptions now in question, with others.*

Now because in that late Censure of theirs, they all founded the divine right of their Episcopal Super-intendency and Dominion over their fellow-Presbyters, only on the Examples of *Timothy* and *Titus*, (whom they then new consecrated Diocesan Bishops over *Ephesus* and *Crete*, almost 1600 years after their decease, though *Christ* and *Paul* himself had never done it in their life times;) and on a supposed Divine Monopoly of conferring *Orders* and imposing hands, appropriated (as they hold) by God himself, to Diocesan Bishops, distinct in Jurisdiction, power and degree from Ministers and Presbyters: I have therefore here for the future quieting of this much agitated Controversie, confined my discourse within the lists of such questions (not formerly fully debated in the English tongue by any that I have met with) by the discussion whereof, I have (I suppose) so shaken these rotten pillars, and undermined these (*o*) *sandy foundations* of their high towring, overa Mat. 7. 26. 27. swelling Hierarchy, as that I have left them no divine prop or ground-work to support it longer; so as it must now certainly (for any stay is left it in the scripture) come tumbling down headlong to the very ground, (and me thinks I hear the fall of it already sounding in my ears) unless with speed they wholy quit these false foundations, and bottom their Prelacy and Jurisdiction

risdiction only on his* *Majesties Princely favor* as Supream *Head* and *Governor* on earth of the Church of *England* (not Gods or Christs divine institution) which because they have so lately judicially disclaimed in open Court, and even at *this present execute all Acts of Episcopal jurisdiction by their own inherent power, without any special Commissions from his Majesty under his great Seal, keeping their Courts, visitations, and making out all their Citations, Process, Excommunications, probate of wills, Letters of Administration, &c. in their own names, and under their own Episcopal Seals, as if they were absolute Popes and Monarchs, contrary to the Statutes of* 25. H 8, c. 19. 26. H. 8. c. 1. 37. H. 8. c. 7. 1 Edw. 6. c. 2. 1 Eliz. c. 1. 8 Eli. c. 1. *their Oaths of Supremacy*, and their *High-Commission* it selfe, which might teach them another Lesson (seing it confines them to do all things by his Majesties special Commission, in his Name and under his Seal alone, when they are all joined together, much more therefore when they are divided in their several Dioces) and because they have contrary to all these Acts and their Oaths * *blotted out Cæsars Image and superscription, his Arms and royal Title out of their Courts processe, seales all their Ecclesiastical proceedings, and inserted only their own in lieu thereof, that so they may appear to all the world to be no longer his but their own, and he (if he should chance to challenge and resume them as his own) might not henceforth own or claim them to be his*; they have little reason now to attempt again, and his Majesty far less reason to suffer; and so having neither God nor the King, divine nor humane Right to support them, they must, (as the proverb is, *between two stools the arse goes to the ground*) now at last in the midst of their usurped greatnesse, speedily fall flat unto the ground *this* and *fall* their q *prove very great*, because they now of late are grown so, * *not being content with the office of a Bishop, but they must be also Kings, temporal Lords and chief State-officers, against Christs expres's command and Gods own Law, to sway both Church and State at pleasure, that so they may ingross* † *into their sacred hands the sole rule and government of the world, having great possessions, and being great Lords also as they are Prelates, and yet doing little or nothing therefore in point of preaching, feeding and instructing the people comitted to their spiritual charge, but onely playing the part of a Bishop, as a Christmas game-player doth*

* See the Statute of 13. R. 2. Stat. 2. c. 1. 16. R. 2. c. 5. 26. H. 8. c. 1. 14. 26. 31. H. 8. c. 9. 37. 11. l. c. 1. E. 6. c. 2. 1. Eli. c. 1. 8. Eliz. c. 1. 25. H. 8. c. 19. 21. 27. H. 8. c. 15. 28. H. 8. c. 7. 10. 31. H. 8. c. 20. 14. 32 H. 8. c. 22. 24. 26. 33. H. 8. c. 9. 34. & 35. H. 8. c. 17. 13. 35. H. 8. c. 1. 3.

* *See Sir* John Davis *his Irish Reports. f. c. 97. 98. an excellent passage to this purpose.*

q Mar. 7. 27.

* *Doctor* Barns *Art cles. Artic.* 8. *p.* 21. 1. *Master* Tyndals *Practise of Popish Prelates P.* 34. 34. &c. *And obedience of a Christian Man.*

† 37. H. 8. c. 17.

doth of a King, and as a Poppet, which springeth up and down, and cryeth peep, peep, and goeth his way, as * Doctor Barns writes wittily of the Bishops of his age. Which swelling greatness and ambition of theirs, as it will make their downfal the greater, so the speedier, it being a sure prognostick of their approaching ruin, as the greatness of any unnatural swelling in the body is of its present ensuing rupture; u *pride ever going before destruction, and a lofty spirit before a fall*, and they usually dogging them at the heels; because * *God himself resisteth the proud*, but then most of all when they are at the highest, according to that of the Psalmist, † *Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth like drosse*, which as soon as ever it hath gotten up to the top of the pot, and elevated it self above the pure mettle, is then scummed off and cast away.

If these my unworthy Labours shal through Gods blessings on them, and thy prayers concurrence with them, contribute any assistance towards our Lordly Prelates *necessary reformation*, or in case of obstinate perseverance in their Exorbitances and Usurpations to their deserved speedy downfall (so far as they are opposite to piety, humility, unity, the propagation of the Gospel, and practical power of holiness) for the ease, relief or comfort of Gods poor people, (*who are now every where most wrongfully, without, yea* † *against all Law and reason oppressed, and cast out of their benefices, freeholds, possessions, imprisoned, fined, excommunicated, silenced, suspended, vilified, crushed and troden under feet by their intolerable tyranny, might and unbounded extravagant power*;) I shall neither repent me of the penning, nor thou thy self of the reading of it. Wherefore here humbly prostrating it to thy impartial Censure, and commending it to the blessing of God, who to shew the infiniteness of his wisdom and power, doth oft times (z) *chuse the foolish things of the world, to confound the things that are mighty, and base things of the world, and things that are despised, yea and things that are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence.* I shall take my leave of thee till some further occasion.

Farewell, *And pray for me in my undemerited Bonds.* W. P.

* *What the Keyes of the Church be.* pag. 206.

u *Prov.* 16. 18.

* 1 *Pet.* 5. 5.

† *Psa.* 119. 119.

* *See* Thomas Beacon *his supplication, Vol.* 3. *of his Works in folio fol.* 21. *to* 25. *A most excellent passage to this purpose suitable to our times.*

† *Magna Charta c.* 29. *The Petition of Right.* 3. Caroli, *and other Statutes in Rastal Accusation.*

z 1 *Cor.* 1. 27. 28. 29.

An *Appendix* touching the *Occasions* and *Ends* of Re-printing this *Treatise*, to prevent all mis-constructions.

Kind Reader,

THE *Occasions* inducing me to *Reprint this Treatise*, (which I compiled above 24 years since whiles imprisoned in the Tower, by the causeless malice of some swaying *Prelates*) were three;

First, the boldness of a *Popish priest*, (under the disguise of a *Sectary*) in Re-printing a pernicious *Pamphlet*, entituled, *Erastus Junior*: *London*, 1660. sitting this Parliament, with his name prefixed to it, (Printed without a name some few moneths before) wherein he endeavors to prove: *The Ministers of the Church of England*, whether *Episcopal* or *Presbyterian*, to be *no Ministers*; and their *Ordination* no *legal Ordination*, and thence infers: *Our Church to be no Church*, *Our Sacraments to be no Sacraments*; *because our Ministers are no lawful ordained Ministers*.

Secondly, The *Extravagancies* of some of our *reviving English Bishops* and *Episcopal Clergy men*, who shaking hands with the *Council of Trent*, [b] *Bellarmine*, [c] *Jansenius*, *Erastus Junior* and our *Romish Adversaries*, even after their late years suppression and tribulation under the Cross, (*which should have* [d] *crucified the world to them*, *and them unto the world*, and made them more *moderate and milde* to their *fellow Ministers* then yet they shew themselves) disown all *Ordinations* made by *Presbyters*; during our long lasting troubles, pronouncing them *NVL* and *VOID*; and refusing to admit *Ministers ordained by Presbyters* to *Benefices* or *Fellowships*, unless they will *renounce their Orders*, and *receive a* RE ORDINATION BY BISHOPS: whereby they [e] *VNCHVRCH* all Presbyterian Protestant Churches both at

[a] Sessio. 23. de Sacramento Ordinis cap. 4. Surius Tom. 4. p. 965.
[b] De Clericis l. 3. q. 2.
[c] Alexipharmacum & Spongia
[d] Gal. 6.14. Eph. 4. 31.32.
[e] Bishop *Laud's* Conference with *Fisher* p. 175. 176. Bishop *Mountagu*. Originum Eccles. Tom. 1 pars posterior. p. 464. Canterburies Doom. p. 89. to 335.

at home and abroad, and NVL both their *Ministry* and *Sacraments*; whereas they grant *Ordinations made by Popish Bishops and Priests*, even in *Rome* and *Spain* it self, to be *lawful*, *valid*, and all Sacraments administred by *them to be good*, and *not to be repeated*; never *RE-ORDAINING* or *REBAPTIZING* any *Masse Priests*, or *Jesuits* who turn *Protestants*, but freely admitting them to exercise their Ministry without questioning their *Popish Ordination*: Which *present Error* and *Exorbitancy* of theirs, tending highly to the *scandal*, *dishonour*, *subversion* of most protestant *Churches*, and *dissatisfaction* of all such who have received the *Lords Supper*, *Baptism*, or *Orders* from Presbyterian *Ministers* not ordained by Episcopall Bishops, pretending themselves Superior to *Presbyters*, and claiming the *sole power of Ordination*, not by *Ecclesiastical Constitution*, or the *Kings concession*, but by *DIVINE RIGHT*, principally grounded on the *imaginarie Episcopacies* of *Timothy*, *Titus*, and *Angel of the Church* of *Ephesus*; I long since refuted in this *Treatise* in such an irrefragable manner, that none of our *Bishops*, or their *Chaplains*, ever yet replied thereto in above 24 years space: whereupon I deemed it very seasonable to reprint it now, for publick peace and satisfaction.

See Mr. Rutherfords Due Rights of Presbytery ch. 8. sect. 8.

Thirdly, the late unseasonable Motions of some *Members* in the *Commons House* it self, *That all Ministers ordained* by *Presbyters during our late Troubles should be put from their Livings & Ministry, unlesse they were reordained by Bishops within one moneth; since all Serjeants at Law made in these times, were recalled and made Serjeants by new Writs from the King*: they putting no difference between *Ordination*, (a divine Ordinance conferred by *Presbyters* on others in all ages, Churches by a divine *Right* warranted by Scripture) and the call of *Serjeants at Law*, a meer humane institution, peculiar to *England*, an inseparable branch of the † *Kings prerogative*, the fountain of all honour as well Civil as Military.

g Aug. 15. and 17. 1660.

† Fortescue de laudibus legum Angl. c. 50. Dyer f. 72. Cowels Interpreter. Tit. Serjeant. Crooks 1 Report. f. 1. 2. 3. 4. 12. 67. 71. 84. 197. 567. 584. 600.

As these were the only occasions, so the sole ends I aimed at in republishing this *Discourse*, are,

1. The Vindication of the *infallible Truths* of God; the *Divine Rights of Presbyters and* the common *people*; and of our *Kings just Prerogative* in and *over all Persons and causes Ecclesiasticall*

fiastical, as well as civil, from the *Errors*, *Impostures*, *Usurpations*, of ambitious self-seeking * *Popes and Prelates.*

* 1 Eliz. c. 1. 37. H. 8. c. 17.

2. The prevention of all future Controversies in our Church touching the *superiority of Bishops over Presbyters*, *their new Monopoly of conferring Orders*, *and exercising all sorts of* Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over *Ministers and people*, in their Visitations, Courts, and imposing Oaths upon them, in their *own names*, *rights and under their own seals* alone, by pretext of *A DIVINE RIGHT*, without any *Commission* from our Kings, contrary to the *Statutes* of 26. *H.* 8. c. 1. 37. *H.* c. 17. 1. *E.* 6. c. 2. 1. *Eliz.* c. 1. 5. 7. *Eliz.* c. 1. The Petition of right. 3. *Caroli*, and 17. *Caroli*, c. 11.

3. The reclaiming of our *Bishops and Prelatical Clergy* at this present from reviving their pristine *Excesses*, *Errors*, Innovations, pressures, which occasioned our late troubles, and their own Overthrow, when they reputed themselves most secure and *b best established*, and may probably ingender new *Distractions* if persisted in, more fatal to them then the former, out of which they are but newly delivered by his Majesties most happy Restoration to His *Crown*, through the *Prayers* and Loyal *Endeavors* of many of those *Presbyterians* whom they now overmuch *maligne*, *oppress and discontent.*

b Psal. 30. 6.

4. To reconcile and unite (as much as may be) the *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian Clergy*, by discovering and moderating both their *Excesses*, *Extremities*, and Usurpations of k *Bishops* over Presbyters (occasioned by (i) *Bishops* great temporal Possessions, and secular imployments, diverting them from *constant preaching*, which (l) *Christ* himself and *his Apostles*, together with (m) St. *Ambrose*, (n) *Chrysostom*, (o) *Augustine*, (p) *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, (q) *Aidan* of old, and (r) Bishop *Hooper*, Bishop *Ridley*, (s) Bishop *Jewel* of later times, practised once or twice *EVERY DAY of the week without intermission*; being the (t) *principal*

i Polychronicon l. 4. c. 26. John Frith his Answer to Sir Thomas Mores Preface.

k Mat. 26. 45. Rom. 14. 43. Luk. 19. 47.

l Act. 2. 46. c. 5. 42. c. 17. 17. c. 19. 9. Heb. 3. 3. 1. Tim. 4. 1. 2.

m De Sacramentis l. 4. 1. l. 5. c. 1. n Homil. 3. 5. 7. 9. 13. 22. in Genes. 20. 21. 23. 27. 29. 35. 37. (o) in Joan. p. Catech. Oratio 7. & 14. Catech. Mystag. 14. Socrates Eccles. Hist. l. 7. c. 2. q Beda Eccles. Hist. l. 3. c. 5. 6. &c.

o Tract. 9. 16.

r Fox Acts and Monuments, p. 1366. 1559. 1456. 1696. s His life before his works t Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 15. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 17. 18. c. 9. 14. to 20. Acts 20. 28. 30. 36. Rom. 10. 8. 15. c. 16. 25. Col. 1. 23. 28. Phil. 1. 15. 16. Eph. 3. 8. 1 Tim. 3. 17. c. 4. 13, 14. 15. 16. c. 31. 2. Tit. 2. 3. 9. 1 Tim. 4. 1. 2.

part of their Episcopal Office, now most neglected by them:) and reducing them to that moderate primitive power and allay, which his Majesties Father King *CHARLES* I. of glorious memory, reduced them unto in his *Treaty* with both houses in the Isle of Wight (u) *wherein* (by his last paper but one) *he abolished all but the Apostolical Bishops, invested only with a Negative voice and power in point of Ordination, divesting them of their Temporalities for 99 years*; That so like the *primitive Bishops*, they might henceforth govern our *Churches*, not by their own sole *arbitrary Injunctions, wils, pleasures*, but by (x) the *COMMON COUNSEL* and *ADVISE OF THEIR PRESBYTERS*, according to such Laws as shall be made in Parliament for that purpose; this being most consonant to Antiquity and tending best to Christian unity.

For my own part, I sincerely profess, that after many years diligent search, disquisition, perusal of most ancient and modern *Treatates of Church Government*; by the learnedst Advocates for *Popes, Bishops, Presbyterians, Independents*, and *Congregational Sectaries* of all kinds, I could * never yet satisfie my judgment or conscience, that *Jesus Christ or his Apostles* had positively, plainly and peremptorily, prescribed or erected any such superiority of Bishops in power, rule, jurisdiction, or degree above other Ministers and Presbyters, as Popes and Bishops have long contended for; nor yet any such unalterable universal forms of Church Government, and Discipline to be observed in all Churches, places, ages, as some over-rigid Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and other Sectaries have fancied and prescribed, to the prejudice of the supream Authority of Christian Kings and Magistrates in and over Ecclesiastical Persons and causes. For *the Gospel* (by Christ's express *command*) *being to be* (y) *preached to all Nations and people throughout the whole world, and that successively till all the Elect of God shal be gathered into the Militant and translated to the Church triumphant at the end of the world*: And most *Nations in the world* (z) *differing* from each other in their *Manners, Customs, Lawes, Rites and Civil forms* of Government (though (a) of *divine institution*, as much as *Ecclesiastical Government*, in the general) and the secular laws, governors and Governments of most Nations through

u See my Speech. p. 66. 67. 68.

x Hieron. in Epist. ad Tit. Gersomus Bucerus. De Gubernatione Eccles. Davidis Bondelli Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi Amstelodami 1646. Bishop Ushers model of Episcopacy.

* See my 12 serious Questions touching Church Government. London 1644.

y Mat. 28. 19. 20. Mar. 16. 15 16. Col. 1. 6. 23 Rom. 10. 18. c. 25. 26. Eph. 3. 3. to 20. c. 4. 11. 12. 13.

z Boemus de Moribus Gentium. Alexander ab Alexandro Gen. Dierum: Purcas Pilgrimage & Pilgrim.

a Rom. 13. 1. 2. 3. Col. 1. 16. 17. Tit. 3. 1. 1. Tim. 2. 1. 2. 3.

through tract of time, wars, usurpations, divine dispensations, inevitable necessities, differing much in several ages from what they formerly were; it was altogether *Impossible* and *impracticable* to prescribe, establish any particular set form of Church Government and Governors in and under the Gospel, which should or could be universally received, practised, submitted to by all Churches, Countries, Nations and Christians throughout the world, in all succeeding ages, the Government and Governours of the Church in several ages, places, being as variable for the most part as the civil Governors and Government, as Ecclesiastical (b) *Historians, Councils, Canons*, and late years experience evidence beyond contradiction. Upon which consideration, as I have ever readily conformed to that Church Government which the King and Parliament have established, so far forth as it was warranted by our Laws, never opposing our Bishops *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, so far as it was justly claimed and exercised by *Regal* and *Legal Authority*: but only its illegal Innovations, Exorbitances, and pretended *Divine sanction*, as distinct from & paramount *Presbytery*; So I shal now earnestly intreat, (and O that I might perswade) all Bishops, Prelates, Presbyters, Independents and Sects whatsoever, to lay aside all unnecessary contests about *Precedency*, *Church government*, *superfluous Ceremonies* and *Formalities*: * *To study to walk worthy of that Christian Vocation, wherewith they are called, with all lowlinesse and meekenesse, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in Love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; they being but one body, having but one spirit, one hope of their calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all: To seek, pursue,* † *follow peace with all men, and holinesse, without which no man shall see the Lord*: And patiently to expect, and cheerfully to submit to that *Modell* of Church government, (with just liberty to truly tender consciences in points not fundamental & consistent with publick peace) which we all hope will ere long be setled by his Majesties pious endeavours, and *Royall Authority* (according to the Ministers and Commons House *Addresses to his Majesty* in pursuance of his own own Royal Letters and Declarations sent from *Breda*) with the Advice of

b See Centur. Magdeb. c. 6. 7. 9. and 10. throughout, Surius, Binius, and Crab, in their Tomes of Councils.

* Eph. 4. 1. 2. 3.

† Heb. 12. 14.

moderate, learned and pious Divines of all formerly dissenting parties and both Houses of Parliament, for the future *tranquillity* and *prosperity* both of our Churches and *Kingdomes*. Over which God long preserve and prosper his *Majesties* most *gracious and pious Reign*, till he shall exchange his *temporal* Crown for an *Eternal*; and his *earthly* Kingdom for an *Heavenly*. (b) *And let all the people thereunto say* Amen: Amen.

b Psal. 106. 40.

Lincoln's Inne,

August 20. 1660. *William Prynne.*

A POSTSCRIPT.

WHereas our Bishops and *Vicars General* (as I am credibly informed) refuse to admit any Ministers ordained by Presbyters to Benefices, unless they will be reordained by Bishops, even since the Parliaments late adjournment; I shall desire them to take notice, that this their practise is expresly against the statute of 13 *Eliz.* ch. 12. intituled, *An act to reform certain disorders touching Ministers of the Church*; which admits such ordinations to be valid, and to make them capable to be presented and admitted to Benefices, as the prologue evidenceth. *That the Churches of the Queens Majesties Dominions may be served with Pastors of sound Religion, Be it enacted by this present Parliament, that every Person under the degree of a Bishop*, which doth or shall pretend to be a Priest or Minister of Gods holy Word and Sacraments, by reason of any other form of Institution, Consecration or Ordering, then the Forms set forth by Parliament, *in the time of the late King of worthy memory King* Edw. the sixth, or now used in the reign of our most gracious Soveraign Lady; *shall in the presence of the Bishop or Guardian of the Spiritualties of some one Dioces where he hath or shall have Ecclesiastical living, declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion, Which only concern the confession of the Christian Faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments* (not Church-Government or Ceremonies) *contained in a Book imprinted, entituled, Articles, &c. under pain of being* ipso facto *deprived.* No subsequent clause of that Act prescribing *Ordination* by *Bishops* to make Ministers capable of Benefices.

This is, by Presbyters, others as Popish Bishops.

Besides, I desire all Bishops and their Advocates to take notice, that neither the Statute of 5 & 6 *Edw.* 6. c. 1. nor the Statute of 8 *Eliz.* c. 1. *prescribing the form and manner of making and consecrating Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, do null, make void, *in point of Law or Divinity*, any other form of Ordination of Ministers, Deacons, or consecration of Archbishops and Bishops by Presbyters, or others, than what is prescribed in these Acts & the Book of Ordination, by any Negative clauses: And the later of these Statutes as it recites, *That* divers quest-

ons *had lately grown upon the making and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within the Realm, whether the same were and be duly and orderly made according to the Law, or not; Whereupon it was thought convenient by this Act, partly to touch such Authorities as do allow and approve the making and consecrating of such Arch-bishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done, according to the Laws of this Realm* (which it declares at large to be only by Act of Parliament, and the Kings *Prerogative Ecclesiastical and Spiritual over the Ecclesiastical state of this Realm*: not by any divine Right or Canonical Sanctions.) So upon this account it only enacts in the affirmative, *That such order and form for the consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the making of Priests, Deacons and Ministers as was set forth in the time of the late King* Edward *the 6. and authorized by Parliament in the 5 and 6 year of the said late King, shall stand and be in full force and effect, and shall from henceforth be used and observed in all places within this Realm, and other the Queens Majesties Dominions and Countries; And that* all persons which have been, or shall be made, ordered or consecrated *Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of Gods holy Word or Sacraments, after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Ministers should be consecrated, made and ordered,* be in very deed, and also by authority hereof, declared and enacted to be, and shal be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered and consecrated, any Statute, Law, Canon, *or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding.* Without any negative Clause, either nulling (in point of Law or Divinity) or prohibiting any other form of ordaining Priests, Ministers, or Deacons, by Presbyters alone, either in our own or other Reformed Churches, beyond the Seas, or nulling any Ordinations made by Popish Bishops and Priests, after the *Roman Pontifical*, and Popish manner, in the reign of *Queen Mary*, in *England* or beyond the Seas, which last though * rejected by our English Bishops and Archbishops in *Edward* the 6 and Qu. *Elizabeths* reigns, *yet they admitted such ordinations to be good, without pressing them to be re-ordained*; And which is most observable, *Cardinal Pool himself*, by authority from the *Pope*, and the *Popish Bishops*, and Parliament of 1 and 2. *Phil.* and *Mary.* ch. 8. did not only confirm all *new Bishopricks, Divisions of Bishopricks, Cathedrals, Churches, Sales of Church-Lands and goods, Marriages,*

* *Antiq. Eccles. Brit. p.* 436, *to* 435.

Institutions to Benefices, and other Promotions Ecclesiastical, Dispensations, and judicial proceedings before Ordinaries, Bishops, and Delegates, during the pretended Schism of *England*, from the Church of *Rome*, from the 20 year of King *Henry* the 8. to this * very Parliament, but likewise ratified all Orders and Benefices conferred on them by Protestant Bishops, Ministers, and Presbyters without any *Re-ordination*; witnesse this Clause in *Cardinal Pools* dispensation, *Ac omnes Ecclesiasticas seculares, seu quorumvis ordinum regulares personas quæ aliquas impetrationes dispensationes, concessiones, gratias & indulta, tam* Ordines *quam* Beneficia Ecclesiastica, *seu alias Spirituales materias prætensa authoritate supremitatis Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, Licet Nulliter, *& de facto obtinuerunt, & ad eor reversa Ecclesiæ unitati restituæ fuerint*, In suis Ordinibus et beneficiis *per nos ipsos, seu a nobis ad id deputatos misericorditer recipiemus, prout jam multæ receptæ fuerunt, seeumque super his opportune in Domino* dispensabimus. And therefore it seems monstrous and unreasonable to me, That our Bishops now after all our late warsand troubles (occasioned by their former Extravagancies, and Excesses) should stil be so obstinate and perverse, as for our Churches present and future peace, not to permit or dispense with *Presbyterian Ordinations, and Ministers made by Presbyters of our own Church Religion, or other reformed Churches*, during our late Shisms and our *Troubles*, when the Pope himself, this Cardinal, & our Popish prelates in Queen *Maries* reign, were so indulgent in this kind; and sundry English Scholars who * fled beyond the Seas to preserve their lives, liberties and religion during her bloudy reign, where they recevied *Ordination* from Presbyters in the Protestant Churches of *Germany* and *Geneva*, were not only allowed & presented to Benefices as lawful Ministers by our Bish. in *Qu. Eliz.* reign upon their return into *England* without any reordination, but one or two of them made *Bishops*, without any prævious Episcopal ordination, and Archb. *Parker* himself consecrated by 3 *Bishops* & a *Presbyter*. And since * Archbishop *Bancroft* him self and other English Bishops, though no friends to *Presbytery*, adjudged some *Scottish Presbyters* ordained only by their *Presbyters* being *Bish* elect in *Scotland* & *Ireland* in King *James* his R. to be lawfully ordained, opposing their *Reordination*, upon this account; that when ordination by a Bish. could not be had, then ordination given by *Presbyters* must be esteemed lawfull, & that they,

* Being near 27 years space.

* *Balæus Scriptorum Brit. Cent. 9. p. 721. to 713. Antiq. Eccles. Brit. p. 420. to 439. Fox Acts and Monuments vol. 3.*

* *See the Interest of England in matters of Religion: p. 67. 57.*

they must not seem to question the *Ministry* & ordination in the Churches abroad, the Confessions of the Reformed Churches of *Helvetia*, *Bohemia*, *France*, *Auspurge*, *Wirtenbirge* and *Suevia*, all averring *Ordination by Presbyters to be just and lawfull, without Bishops, and Bishops and Presbyters by Gods Law to be both one and the same in Order and Jurisdiction*, as you may read at large in the *Harmony of Confessions*, Section 11.

In fine, I shal desire our Bishops to consider, that their own *Ordaining of* * *Ministers by themselves in their private chambers, without Presbyters and other Ministers, or out of their Diocess, or on any day & in any Church*, is more illegal, irregular, null, uncanonical, then any *Ordinations made by Presbyters during the wars* by the *Roman Pontificall*, the *Councils* of *Carthage*, *London*, *Trent*, the Book of *Ordination* it self, & their own applauded *Canons*, anno 1603. Canon 31, to 36. As for their Reordination of *Ministers*; as they can finde no president or warrant for it in Scripture, or solid Antiquity; so the first and only antient president of it I have observed in *England* in former ages, was derived from *Rome*, and brought thence by *Theodore* Archbishop of *Canterbu*. who being sent into *England* by Pope *Vitalian* Anno 670. and ordaining Bishops in all fitting places, reprehended * *Ceadda*, that he *was not rightly consecrated* (being made both a Priest and Bishop too only by the Abbot of *Hy* and his Monks, who were but Presbyters and no Bishops:) *he answered him with a most humble voice*, saying, If you know that I have not rightly taken upon me my Bishoprick I willingly depart from my Office; for I never thought my self to be worthy of it, but for obedience sake, being commanded to undergo it, I consented though unworthy. *Whereupon* Theodore *hearing the humility of his answer, replied, That he ought not to lay down his Bishoprick*, sed ipse ordinationem ejus denuo Catholica Ratione consummabit. Which amounted rather to a confirmation, then a *reconsecration*, & was no *reordination* of him as a *Presbyter*, but only a Reconfirmation of him after the *Roman model*, as a Bishop; and so no president to justifie the *re-ordination* of Presbyterian Ministers by our Bishops now, who may as warrantably *rebaptize* all children baptized by them, as *reordain* them Ministers, for which they have neither Scripture, Canon, statute, much less reason or discretion in such a time as this, which may instruct them that *Immodicis brevis est ætas & rara senectus*.

* *Now daily & unduly practised.*

* *Simeon Dunelmensis* Hist. *col.* 253.254.

* *Beda. Eccles. Hist. l.* 4. *c.* 1. 2.

Quest.

Questionlesse did our pragmatical Bishops seriously consider that of (a) St. Jerome. *Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi et licentiam tribuas cujus Baptismum probes, aut reprobes ejus Baptismum, quem non existimas esse Sacerdotem*, they durst not with the impudentest Roman *Prelates, Popes, Jesuits*, reject their Presbyterian Ordination as null, whose Baptizations (by vertue thereof) they dare not disallow as invalid; Especially if they remember not only the general consent of the Fathers and Authors hereafter cited, with infinite others as well (b) *Protestants* as (c) *Papists, that by divine Institution, and in the Apostles times, Bishops and Presbyters were both one and the same in Appellation and Office*; but also the absolute *invincible Necessity*, that during our late publick Changes, and Arbitrary Tyrannical powers then swaying, lay upon all young Divines to receive *Ordination*, either from *Presbyters alone*, (it being an unpardonable Crime either in our suppressed surviving Bishops to give *Ordination* to, or for them to receive it from their hands) or else to usurpe the Office of the Ministry without any Ordination at all, against their Consciences, Judgements, and *Ordinances of Parliament*, as many *Mechanicks, Anabaptists and Independents* did, with an intention to subvert the Ministry; which pressing *Necessity*, not only by the divine Law of God, but the resolution of Popes, Popish Canonists, and Canons themselves, (on which our Bishops now most insist) as well as of Protestant Divines, is a supersedeas, and dispensation to all Canonical circumstances, requisite to Ordination in a usual way, in peaceable times, and to Bishops concurrence in them; For proof whereof, I shall recommend both to our Bishops, Presbyters, Parliament, Civil Magistrates and others considerations, desiring peace or unity in our Church, this memorable discourse of Learned *Gisbertus Voetius*, Professor of Divinity in *Utrech*, who after a large and solid refutation of this first *Hypothesis* of *Cornelius Jansenius*, a Popish Doctor of *Lovain*. (d) *Omnem Vocationem ordinariam, atque adeo totam essentiam potestatis & Ministerii Ecclesiastici esse ab Episcopo. Quia tota essentia & ratio vocationis continetur in Ordinatione,*

a *Adverss. Luciferianos.*
b *Tractatus de Ætatibus Eccl. c. 2. apud, Mat. Illericum Catal. Testium Veritatis, p. 433, &c. Laurentius Valla Annot. in Acta Apost. c. 15. Petrus Viretus de Minist. Verbi Dei l. 1. c. 19. Erasmus Rot. Annot. in 1 Tim. c. 4. Gisbertus Voetius Desperata Causa Papatus l. 2. sect. 1 c. 9.*
c *Dionys. Carthusianus & Contarenus in Phil. 1. 1. & Tit. 1. Gul. Durantes Rational l. 2. c. de Episcopis, Lancelotus Instit. juris Canon l. 1. Tit 21. Azorius part 2. l. 3. c. 16. Zanchez. Com in Acts 13. Mich Medina Aureolus, Petrus de Palude, Soncinas in 4. Sent. distin. 25. See Bellarmin, de Cler. l. 1. c. 15.*
d *Desperata Causa Papatus Amstelodami 1635. l. 2. sect. 2. c. 12. p 185, &c.*

† qux

quæ * soli Episcopo competit; both by Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, Histories, which he proves to belong originally to the whole Church, and Ministerially to the Presbytery, and to Bishops only as Presbyters (not Diocæsan Prelates) by divine institution and usage: so he refutes his 9. and 10. *Hypotheses*, (grounded on the first) by arguments and instances pertinent to our purpose in this manner.

* *The very Devotions of our present Bishops now.*

a P. 109. Nona Hypothesis (*a*) *Vocatione ordinaria cessante non posse eam resarciri aut restitui in Ecclesia, nisi per extraordinariam & immediatè divinam.*

Refut. I. Vocationem divinam mediatam & ordinariam (*b*) adversarii definiunt quam Christus peragit *per vicarios suos Pontifices* & Episcopos. At tali vocatione cessante, id est, absque Pontifice aut Episcopo, non posse vocari Ecclesiæ ministrum, nisi denuò de cœlo & immediatè Deus vocet ut olim Prophetas aut Apostolos, commentum est Jansenianum; quod ne unico quidem iota, aut solido argumento ex sacris literis probavit. Quam facile autem ab illo dicitur, tam facile nos negamus, de manuum impositione ab Epiſcopo χειροθεσια necessariò peragent, absque quo scil. actum esset de omni ordinatione & manuum impositione: non aliter ac (*c*) Thalmudistæ de suo סמוכין j. χειροθεσια R. Iuda fil. Baba commentantur.

b *Cornel. à Lapide in Romam. 10.*

c *Refert Scaliget in Elenche Tribæres. c. 10.*

II. Si Pontifex non est de essentia Ecclesiæ Oecumenicæ neque Episcopus de essentia Ecclesiæ particularis: Ergo nec vocatio Papæ aut Episcopi est de essentia vocationis Ecclesiasticæ ad ministerium. Sed verum prius, Ergo & posterius. Et consequenter potest prætenso illo ordine & ordinario Iansenii cessante, resarciri nihilominus Ecclesiastica vocatio. Minor probatur, Quia cum sedes Papalis per annum aut biennium vacavit, cum Papæ sederunt hæretici, intrusi, apotactici, apostatici, illegitimi (ut suo loco ostensum est) vocationes Ecclesiasticæ tamen peractæ sunt, & peractæ fuissent in Gallia, siquidem auferibilitas Papæ in actum fuisset deducta. Quomodo etiam non cessarunt in Anglia sub Henrico VIII. Et in Hispania atque Italia hujus independentiæ egregium specimen aliquando dedisse Carolum V. & Regem Gallorum, testis est Thuanus,

nus, quem vide cit. infra lib. 3. ſect. 3. c. 6. Et ſi in remota aliqua inſula Epiſcopus aut Epiſcopi obiiſſent, non tamen ideo in nihilum abire paterentur omnem vocationem miniſtrorum, ſed in illo caſu ſuperſtites Clerici & Presbyteri facerent quod in ſe eſt.

III. Reſarciri poteſt & debet ſucceſſio & vocatio paſtorum ab ipſa Eccleſia, hoc eſt, cætu & collectione fidelium licet omnibus Epiſcopis & Presbyteris deſtituta. * Habet enim quælibet Eccleſia eſſentialiter & propriè poteſtatem vocandi, licet actus quoſdam illius vocationis quibuſdam perſonis demandet. Ut enim Pontifex creatur & conſecratur per eos qui non ſunt pontifices, & ſummus Sacerdos in V. T. per inferiorem aliquem conſecratus eſt, ut vult (a) Lyranus; ſic Epiſcopus à Presbyterio, & Presbiter ab aliquo Eccleſiæ membro ad id ſingulariter reliquorum ſuffragiis delegato, proclamari, conſtitui et in poteſtatem miniſterii mitti poſſet. Quid etiam vetaret ſolemnitatem illam conſecrationis in illo neceſſitatis caſu omitti, & legittimè electum miniſterio ſuo nihilominus fungi? Nihil hic eſt quod ex jure divino formalitatum iſtarum *neceſſitatem medii* inducat.

* *See here p.* 72, 73, 77, 78, 82, 83, 86.

(a) *Lyran. Poſtilla in Levitic. c. 8. Vide Paulo poſt cit. A Lapide in Hebr. 7. v. 7.*

Pone caſum, in inſula aliqua inacceſſa aut incognita primum colligi Eccleſiam, nullumque ibi adhuc clericatus ſeu miniſterii ordinem eſſe conſtitutum. Pone & alterum caſum, per belli ſævitiam, aut inundationem, morbum epidemicum, terræ motum, aut vim quamcunque majorem, omnes paſtores ibi ſimul abſumtos. Quid in extremo illo neceſſitatis caſu facerent reliquiæ fidelium? An omni ſalute, & externis ſalutis mediis, quæ vel veſtra vel noſtra ſententia à miniſterio Eccleſiaſtico dependent, in perpetuum ſe excludi paterentur? An exſpectarent donec ex altero mundo, aut ex cœlo immediate ipſis mitteretur ſive Epiſcopus ſive paſtor? Minime ſane. * Poteſt poteſtas totius Eccleſiæ illo in caſu præſtare illos actus, quos aliàs ordinariò in Eccleſia integraliter perfecta & bene conſtituta anteceſſoribus & Presbyterio ſolet committere. Poteſt per ſe exequi, quod per ordinarios delegatos alioquin exequeretur, ſi quidem neceſſitas ferret legem. Et tunc non

* *See here p.* 82, 86, 87.

eſſet vocatio aut ordinatio immediata, ſed mediata; quamvis medio non ordinario & uſitato. Aliud eſt enim immediatum, aliud extraordinarium, ut ſupra diximus. Ponamus alium caſum. Quid ſi Papa mortuo, Cardinales omnes conclave ingreſſi pulvere tormentario (ut tentatum in Anglia) aut veneno, aut ferro (ut Templarii) aut terræ hiatu, aut incendio, aut igni Sodomæ, (de quo Fr. Petrarcha) aut alia aliqua vi majori, aut ab Antichriſto Papiſtico, ſive ex Suecia, ſive aliunde prodeunte, tollerentur: an nulla ſupereret canonica Pontificis vocatio & Petrina ſucceſſio? an nulla ſpes generis lapſi ſarcire ruinas? Tale quid extraordinarium indicare voluit Origenes Homil. 11. in 18. Numer. *Evangelizanti*, inquit, *contingere poſſe, ut poſtmodum communi jam converſorum ſuffragio Epiſcopus eorum eligatur.* Et *ſic Ambroſius puer, deinde totius populi voce acclamatus Epiſcopus, per prophetiam Epiſcopus factus eſt: vox enim populi vox Dei*, ſunt verba Corn. à Lapide. Comment. in 1 Timoth. 1. verſ. 18. Et majori jure de poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica nos dicimus, quod de Politica effutire auſus fuit Bellarminus libr. 3. de Laicis cap. 6. *Poteſtas immediate eſt tanquam in ſubjecto, in tota multitudine, & ſi cauſa legitima adſit, poteſt multitudo mutare regnum* (quidni Papalem aut Epiſcopalem Monarchiam?) *in Ariſtocratiam aut Democratiam.*

IV. Aliis in caſibus ordinario ſeu ordine quod ad formalitates & leges poſitivas ceſſante, non opus eſt ceſſare omnem vocationem, aut recurrere ad vocationem immediatam. Ordinis poſitivi eſt, ut quis primo cooptetur in Claſſem Presbyterorum, atque ita ſucceſſive promoveatur ad Epiſcopatum; Adhæc, ut quis ad curam Eccleſiæ vocetur non immediatè ex ſtatu laicali, ſed ex clericali, nedum ut ex Catechumenis vocetur. Et tamen Ambroſius (a) *provinciæ præfectus & Catechumenus* ſuffragiis populi & approbatione Epiſcoporum, Mediolanenſis Epiſcopus conſtitutus eſt. Sæpe etiam ex Laicis aſſumpti ſunt ad curam Eccleſiæ, ut Frumentius ab Athanaſio, teſte Theodoreto. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 1. cap. 23. Aliquando etiam Laici propter defectum Presbyterorum ante ullam vocationem Eccleſiaſticam

a *Socrates hiſt. Eccl lib. 4. cap. 25. Zozomenus lib. 6. cap. 24.*

asticam iis actibus functi sunt, quibus Presbyteri ex ordine defungi solent. Sic *Ædesius & Frumentius in vero Dei cultu educati mercatores qui in Indiam commeabant, cohortati sunt, ut in unum congregati* (ut fert mos Romanorum) *divina mysteria obirent*, (Gr. τὰς θείας ἐπιτελεῖν λειτουργίας προέτρεπον) teste eodem Theodor. loc. cit. Jam argumentor à pari, si non à majori ad minus: Cœtus fidelium æquè aut multo magis potuisset constituere Frumentium doctorem suum absque ductu Episcopi aut Presbyterii (siquidem reditus Frumentio & Ædesio fuisset negatus) quam potuit fideles in cœtum colligere & divina mysteria obire. Conventus exulum fidelium ordinat Mosen, Ruffin. libr. 11. cap. 6. Socrates libr. 4. cap. 36. & Zanctius in Act. 8. 4. & 11. vers. 19, 20. cum Baronio tradit plus 15000. Hierosolymis excessisse ad propagandum Evangelium, quos tamen canonice & in amplissima forma ordinatos fuisse non credo. (a)

V. Non in Hypothesi, sed tantum in thesi hic disputamus pro salute Ecclesiæ in tali casu necessitatis; ne homines intoleranda audacia ab ordine positivo, humano (quam recto & legitimo nunc non disputamus) suspendant omnem Essentiam & salutem Ecclesiæ, quam Deus ne sacramentis quidem à se institutis alligavit, ut adversarii fateri coguntur. Esse autem potestatem illam Episcopalem supra alios pastores, & nominatim potestatem ordinandi pastores & continuandi ac propagandi ministerium Ecclesiasticum meræ constitutionis humanæ supra probavimus sect. 1. cap. penult. & discere debuissent adversarii à Leone (b) 1. Episcopo Romano, qui *sacerdotibus quædam dicit prohibita per canones Ecclesiasticos, ut conseerationem Prerbyterorum & diaconorum.* Ergo vocatione ordinaria (per Episcopum scil. nunc ita dictum) cessante, manerent tamen aut instaurari possent vocationes in Ecclesia, idque de jure divino; absque immediato illo & extraordinario quod hic fingit lansenius. Sed casus hic non accidit primis ministris reformatoribus, qui omnes erant consecrati ab Episcopis. De successoribus diximus sect. 1. cap. cit.

Decima Hypothesis: (c) *Nullam necessitatem, nullum casum prætexi posset à Reformatoribus, quo ipsis licuerit facere quod fecerunt*

a *Ita factum olim à fratribus Bohemis (quos picardos vocant) Anno 1456. in peculiares cœtus coëuntibus, & ex 12. electis, tres Ministros forte designatos sibi constituentibus. Lazicius in Apolog. contra Magnum Ducem Moscorum c. 9.*

b *Epistol. 85. ad Episc. Gallic. & German.*

c *P. 178, 179, 180, 183.*

fecerunt in ordinatione ministrorum & reformatione Ecclesiæ contra receptum ordinem & absque ordinarii ministerii authoritate.

Necessitas hic statui potest duplex, una circa vocationem & ordinationem legitimam ministrorum, ut scilicet omnia requisita & consueta formalia servari aut haberi non possint, quæ legibus positivis & humanis præscribuntur.

Altera est, circa ipsum ministerii exercitium, quando in Doctrinæ & Ecclesiæ propagatione aut instauratione ordo externus, seu bene ordinata dispositio & communio inter docentes & discentes & utrorumque inter se, tam præcise observari non potest, ac leges *διαξίας* & decori Ecclesiastici præscribunt. De utraque necessitate agimus; hic potissimum de priori, alibi (a) de posteriori.

a Cap. 18, 19.

Refutatio I. Ex eo quod in cultu Instituto per ipsum jus divinum, cæsus necessitatis relaxationem adferebat. Exemplum esto Levit. 5. vers. 11. *Quod si non quiverit manus ejus duos offerre turtures aut duos pullos columbarum, offerret pro peccato suo similæ partem ephi decimam.* Collatum cum Hebr. 9. 22. *Et sine sanguinis effusione non fit remissio.* Ubi Carthusianus: *Non fiebat expiatio culpæ, nisi necessitas impediret oblationem: tunc enim sufficiebat bonum propositum.* Alterum exemplum est, precum & exercitiorum publicorum in Ecclesia, communio, ac frequentatio, quæ primaria pars est *cultus instituti* Psal. 122. vers. 1, 2. Hebr. 10. vers. 24, 25. per quam *cultum naturalem* fidei, spei & charitatis ingenerari, conservari & augeri necesse est; sine qua tamen in casu necessitatis propter persecutionem, incarcerationem, deportationem in terras infidelium, Deum quis religiose potest colere, & salvari. Ergo & legem illam de ordinatione ministri per Episcopum aut tres Episcopos, secundum placita hominum, aut Presbyterorum collegium secundum apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum, in tali casu non fert necessitas. Siquidem hic tenet regula illa: *Misericordiam volo & non sacrificium.* Hose. 6. 6. à * Christo Davidi comedenti panes propositionis, & discipulis vellentibus spicas in Sabbatho tanquam in casibus necessitatis applicata.

* Mat 9.13. & 12. 7, 8.

Ex eo quod omnes leges humanæ seu positivæ Ecclesiasticæ,

aſticæ, etiam poſitivæ divinæ, ſaltem ex cenſu adverſariorum, huc uſque non obligent, quin in ſummo caſu neceſſitatis, ſalutis ſcil. aut perditionis animarum, poſthaberi poſſint. (a) *Quod non eſt licitum in lege, neceſſitas licitum facit*, eſt regula juris civilis & canonici; quam in jure civili ex ſpecialibus caſibus declarat Bronchorſt. de Regul. juris; & in canonico Antoninus; ubi poſt illatos caſus, tum ex Scriptura tum ex Theologia Papali, ſubdit: *Neceſſitas non habet legem, ſed ipſa ſibi facit legem.* Magiſter Sententiarum (b) contra legem divinam excipit, Infantes in V. T. neceſſitatis cauſa potuiſſe circumcidi ante octavum diem. Et Tartaretus, (c) *Tam divina lex quàm præcepta Dei ſunt cum æquitate penſanda. Et ſi ita ſit, mirandum eſt de dominis Juriſtis, qui nolunt aliquam ἐπιεικειαν cadere in ſuis literis. Nonne dicebat ſapiens,* *Noli eſſe nimis juſtus. Immo æquitas ſeu ἐπιεικεια præponenda eſt juri naturali. Et iſtud eſt quod vult habere iſtud dictum, ipſæ etiam leges cupiunt ut jure regantur, id eſt, ἐπιεικειᾳ & æquitate.*

a Antonin part 1. Tit 20. de Regulis juris. In argumentum, & Quid non eſt. See Summa Angel. Tit. Neceſſitas.
b Lib 4 diſt 1. cap. Si vere.
c In queſtionibus moral fol. 17, & 36.
* Eccleſ. 7. 16.

Hinc Cajetanus (d) diſtinguit: *Peccatum mortale in aliquo actu dupliciter inveniri poſſe, aut ſecundum ſe* (hoc eſt ex ſuo genere) *aut ex Eccleſiæ præcepto, cum mutationes aut omiſſiones hujuſmodi non conſtituant actum ſacrilegum ſecundum ſe: quod ex eo patet, quod ſi actus ſecundum ſe eſſet ſacrilegus, in nulla neceſſitate eſſet licitus, &c.* Thomas 2. 2. queſt. 66. hanc generalem exceptionem habet: *Lex poſitiva quando iniquitatem inducit & ſuperiori legi adverſatur, vigorem non habet.* Eſt enim triplex legis *exceptio, quædam judicialis poteſtatis, quædam Doctoralis authoritatis, quædam inevitabilis neceſſitatis, puta quia niſi ſic faciat eſt eminens periculum, & ſic intelligitur,* (e) *quod neceſſitas non habet legem, id eſt, neceſſitas facit interpretationem & exceptionem legis in tali caſu, &c.* Hinc infinitæ illæ exceptiones de caſibus neceſſitatis. De miſſa celebranda amplius quam ſemel in die. *Conſuluiſti* extravag. de celebr. Miſſar.

d In 3. queſt. 67. art. 2.
e Tartaret loc. cit.

Minores quatuordecim annis non poſſent contrahere *niſi pro bono pacis & ex neceſſitate* c. 2. in fi. extrav. de deſponſ. Impuber. (f) Diſpenſari, irritari, & commutari poſſunt vota. In caſu neceſſitatis poteſt Laicus abſolvere ab excommunicatione,

f Zwarez de virt. & ſtatu Relig Tom. 2. de Votis lib. 6. cap. 2. 9, 10.

municatione, Antonin. 3. part. tit. 17. cap. 4. paragr. 7. Item exhibere eucharistiam, extremam unctionem. Hæc tria ita teneri à Canonistis & theologis quibusdam refert Sylvester in voce *Absolutio* cap. 1. & ipse quod ad primum consentit. Item *ab hæretico* & *scismatico*, ut referunt annot. ad, Tolet. lib. 1. cap. 15. & à quocuaque sacerdote, Tolet. cap. cit. Absolvi potest absens, ægrotus qui aliquid, moriens qui nihil confessus est, item qui ex probabili causa non vult omittere peccandi occasionem, item qui tantum est attritus, item qui non absolutus est ab excommunicatione Immanuel Sa in aphorism. *Absolutio. Missa sicca* potest celebrari ut Sacerdos scil. non conficiat; & posse uno die plures Missas celebrare, (a) *ubi necessitas exigit, puta si quis moriatur; & causa honestatis, ut si aliqua magna persona superveniens velit Missam audire*, &c. Et *si defuerit Sacerdos, proximo vel socio facienda est confessio.* Lombard. lib. 4. d. 17.

a Durantes in Rationali. Et Immanuel Sa in Voce Missa. Missa sicca celebratur sine planeta cum vestibus reliquis sacris, vel superpelliceo cum stola in modum crucis & candelis: non sit autem conversio ad populum, nec consecratio, nec ea quæ ad oblationem pertinent.

Sacerdos quilibet in mortis articulo à quibusvis peccatis & censuris potest absolvere, Tolet. lib. 1. cap. 15. Et facultatem illam jure divino esse concessam cuilibet Sacerdoti, deficiente proprio, ex sententia Thomæ, Durandi, Paludani, jure Ecclesiastico esse concessam, ex communi opinione Canonistarum, Tolet. ibid. regularibus mendicantibus tale privilegium concessum etiam extra mortis articulum, Delrio disq. Magic. lib. 6. cap. 1. sect. 3.

Adde *dispensationes* circa irregularitates sive ex defectu, sive ex delicto, de quibus consule, Tolet. lib. 1. cap. 57. & deinceps.

Et omnes dispensationes, indulgentias & absolutiones, in casu necessitatis, circa administrationem Sacramentorum & Sacramentalium, circa Jurisdictionem, regimen & omnia agenda Ecclesiastica, circa leges, jura, statuta omnia, imprimis mediantibus illis (b) *& diligenter nota, quod istæ dispensationes non dantur, nisi qualificatis; nam pauperes consolari non possunt, quia non sunt.* Item circa vota majora & minora. Et de benedicto oleo infirmorum augendo per oleum non benedictum. Ritual. de sacram. extr. unct. pag. 76.

b Vide Richard lib. 4. dist. 38. qu. 1. art. 9. Taxa pœnitentiar.

Item quotidianæ dispensationes Episcopi *in Iejuniis, festis*

&

& ejusmodi à jure seu lege Papæ prohibitis. (a) Quod invitus quis possit absolvi, & per procuratorem (de quo supra cap. 15.) & per epistolam *confiteri.* (b) Et quod sacerdos in casu necessitatis fidelibus alienæ parochiæ sacramenta ministrare potest; & aquâ simplici uti, Ritual. pag. 4. & 21.

III. Circa leges divinas adversarii excipiunt per casus necessitatis; multo magis nobis excipere licet circa leges de formalitatibus Ordinationum Ecclesiasticarum ab hominibus latas: Sic enim Antonin. loc. cit. *A principio generis humani licitè contraxit frater cum sorore, quia ex necessitate id faciebat.* Et paragrapho sequenti, *In necessitate licet furari: quia illud propriè non est furari: quoniam in necessitate scil. extrema, cum aliter subveniri non potest, omnia sunt communia,* dist. 18. *sicut hi.* Et sic communiter statuunt, (c) *Papam posse dispensare de omni lege divina positiva.*

Hinc illæ decisiones de Baptismo (cujus administratio jure divino pastoribus demandata est, Matth. 28. vers. 19. Quod possit fieri à fœminis, Laicis, Judæis, Paganis, in *urina* (ut quidam Doctores sentiunt, referente Guidone de monte Rocherii, (d) in *lixivio*, in *brodio* carnium & piscium. Tolet. libr. 2. cap. 18. Quod infans moriens in flumen vel puteum profundum possit conjici, quamvis mox suffocandus, Rosella, Panormitanus, referrente Sylvestro in voce *Baptismus* num. 4. 10. vide & Tolet. loc. cit. Breviter dispensant circa ministrum, materiam, formam & subjectum baptismi. Et baptismum per Judæum seu Paganum ab Ecclesia esse determinatum refert, Thomas part. 3. quest. 67. art. 5. *Et baptismi formam non vitiari si quid in ea superfluè ponitur, ut si dicatur: Baptizo te in nomine patris, & filii & Spiritus Sancti, & diaboli; vel arma virumque cano, vel si quid præmittitur formæ, &c.* Durandus in Rational. lib. 6. Rubric. 46. fol. 184. Et quod Diaconus absente Episcopo aut Presbytero Eucharistiam erogare possit, Canone *Diacones* distinct. 93. & glossa ibid. *Subdiaconus prædicare potest, quia curam animarum habere potest, &c.* Non refert quis vel qualiter prædicet, sed quid prædicet, distinct. 19. can. *Secundum.*

Innocentius VIII. Norwegis concessit sacrificium absque vino.

a Immanuel Sa in Voce Dispensatio & Iejunium & Festum.

b De confessione per epistolam Romæ disputatum fuisse refert Petr. Math. Hist. l. 7. nart. 2.

c Ioh. Major, aliique sententiarii, cum Canonistis alibi à nobis cit.

d In Manip. Curator. de Baptis. c. 2 fol. 7. & 9. B.

vino. *Judicavit* enim (inquit Bellarm. lib. 4. cap. 24.) *Jus divinum ita interpretandum esse ut excipiatur casus necessitatis. Et si enim sacrificium esset imperfectum, tamen præstat imperfectum habere quàm nullum.* Circa conjugium quamplurimi casus occurrunt, ut ex. gr. *Conjuges malificio affecti post triennii experientiam separantur*, Delrio disquis. Magi. libr. 3. part. 1. quest. 4. sect. 8. *Immo & in nonnullis locis hic usus vigere dicitur, ut vir & mulier priori matrimonio legitimè contracto renuntient mutuo consensu & novum coram Sacerdote contrahunt*, Maximil. ab Eynatten in Manuali Exorcism. p. 3. p. 230.

Dispensationes omnes definiuntur juris declarationes, *cum declaratur legislatorem non intendisse quod in tali casu particulari legem suam voluerit quem obligare.* Gabr. Biel. libr. 3. distinct. 37. quest. unic. art. 1. *Et sic Papa dispensare potest contra statuta Apostolorum quorumcunque, si tamen vim non habeant ex jure naturæ vel divino decreto.* Richardus libr. 4. distinct. 27. quest. 4. art. 4. *Cum causa scil. adest ex parte dispensati, causa, inquam, utilitatis, vel necessitas ejus, vel Reipublicæ.* Petr. de palude libr. 4. distinct. 38. quest. 4. *Dispensandi potestas est favorabilis, & extendenda (quamvis ipsa dispensatio sit odiosa, quia contra jus) adeoque extenditur ad casum in quo eadem ratio, &c.* Immanuel Sa in voce *dispensatio.* Huc pertinent dispensationes omnes, quibus Pontifex & Episcopi contra leges divinas dispensant. Quære apud Symmistas & Canonistas *de pluralitate beneficiorum, & non-residentia.* Non solum parœcias, sed etiam Episcopatus plures potest summus Pontifex uni ex justa causa (*si Cardinales sint aut Regum filii* Lancelot. libr. 1. tit. 27.) conferre, sic sentit Soto, nec dissentit Perronus epistol. ad Villeroy libr. 3. pag. 476. ubi emendicato alio pinguiori Episcopatu, petit ut prior Ebroicensis sibi nihilominus relinquatur, aut per resignationem fruatur saltem mediantibus illis, secundum scil. justitiam commutativam.

Audaciorfactus Gregorius de Valencià: (a) *Quamvis beneficiorum incompassibilium residentiam requirentium pluralitas divino jure vetita sit, ex eo, quod residentia eodem jure præcepta est: ministerialiter tamen summus Pontifex, justa de cau-*

(a) Citatur in annotat. ad Tolet. lib. 5. cap. 81.

sa

sa, potest in ea dispensare, hoc est, pontificia authoritate declarare, adesse causam ob quam æquum sit, &c.

Infantes & pueri etiam ante usum rationis ordinantur in Presbyteros, Episcopos, Cardinales, Canonicos, &c. cum non dico casus necessitatis, *sed rationabilis causa* (de hoc mundo scil.) Pontificis dispensationem hic obtinet. (a)

IV. In ipsa vocatione & ordinatione ministrorum, adversarii casibus necessitatis locum concedunt. Sic enim Gerson. (b) *Fit autem missio aut per Deum immediatè, &c. aut per Deum mediante superiorum authoritate, &c. fit rursus nonnunquam ex ipsa necessitatis lege: quando non aliter posset fidei seu morum veritas inviolata servari. Ubi verum est illud, pasce fame morientem: si non pavisti, occidisti.* Et Antoninus. (c) *In argumentum trahi nequeant, quæ propter necessitatem aliquando sunt concessa. Hæc regula sumpta est, &c. Pone casum. distinct. 55. cap. 1. ubi propter necessitatem ministrorum permissum fuit assumi monachos ad parochiales Ecclesias.* Quod æquè contra Ecclesiæ antiquioris consuetudinem est, ac ordinatio Presbyteri absque Episcopo Diœcesano. Etiam extra casum necessitatis cum alii Presbyteri haberi possunt, dispensant tamen de plerisque irregularitatibus sive ex vitiis animi, sive originis, sive corporis illa oriatur. Excogitant aliquod *quid* pro *quo*, ut defectus ille suppleatur. (d) *Cui virilia abscissa sunt potest ea secum portare in pulverem redacta aut sicca*; ita erit membris scil. integer per analogiam eandem qua cadaver est homo. Rationem generalem quæ in omnibus illis valeat, adducit Antoninus: (e) *Papa potest committere puræ laico, & mulieri, ut excommunicent, quia est de jure positivo.*

Immo & antiqua jura & consuetudinem antiquissimæ Ecclesiæ in multis hic mutarunt. Olim Episcopus vivens ordinabat sibi successorem, ut patet exemplo Theotecni Cæsareæ Episcopi, de quo Euseb. hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 32. cum quo conferatur Adoviennensis in Chronic. Anno 819. ubi de Agobardi successione in locum Leidradi Episcopi Lugdunensis. Ac jam talis ordinatio plane irrita esset in Ecclesia Romana. (f) Sunt etiam dispensationes tum

a Vide quæ infra sect. 3. cap. ult. annotamus. Et addit. ad lib. 6. Toleti cap. 3. & 6.

b Part 2. serm. fact. in Concil. Rhen. domin. 2. post paschæ Pag. 1. tit. 20. In argumentum.

d Vide Toler. lib. 1. cap. 63.

e Part 3. tit. 25. cap. 83.

f Immanuel Sa in Vece dispensatio.

irregularis tum illegitimi ad ordines, hac methodo ſcil. obtinendæ, ut prius diſpenſetur ad beneficium, poſtea in ſecunda petitione diſpenſationis ſuper pluralitate, aut irregularitate) dicat expreſſe ſe eſſe illegitimum aut irregularem. Sic Papas Epiſcopus Oſtienſis aut primus Cardinalis, & Archiepiſcopos ſuffraganei, ſemper quaſi neceſſitate aliqua ordinant, quamvis ipſi non habeant illud quod conferunt, quippe minores juxta Heb. 7. verſ. 7. Hic adverſarii ad incitas theologiæ ſuæ redacti ad neceſſitatem confugiunt, (a) *In hac benedictione quiſque eorum geris vices Dei, qui haſce benedictiones tali modo & per tales (nec enim aliter commode fieri poſſunt) fieri inſtituit, ſeſeque habet, ut miniſter & vicarius Dei, qui major eſt eo qui benedicitur, quiſquis & quantus quantus ille ſit.*

a A Lapide in Comment. ad loc. cit.

Quidni ergo in caſu neceſſitatis, Paſtor à Seniore gubernante (quem Laicum Seniorem vocant) Idemque ut & Epiſcopus à Parocho aut Presbytero docente publicè nomine Eccleſiæ inſtitui poſſet? Siquidem ſolemnis & publica ordinatio omnino requiratur. Quod ſi ab ea ſupersedere quis malit propter defectum Presbyteri docentis, quid vetat Electum Paſtorem miniſterio ſuo nihilominus fungi?

V. Eccleſia reformanda aut jam reformata, poſitivis illis conſtitutionibus & legibus canonicis circa ordinationes Epiſcoporum non fuit ita ſtrictè alligata, ut eas abrogare non potuiſſet. Habet enim hoc quotidiana praxis & doctrina communis adverſariorum, præterquam quod jure divino Eccleſiæ illa poteſtas competit. Quæ enim fecit leges, poteſt etiam eas abrogare, ſi juſta cauſa aut neceſſitas requirat. Sic enim Thomas 1, 2. queſt. 97. art. 1. & 2. *Quod Lex humana in tantum rectè mutatur, in quantum per ejus mutationem communi utilitati providetur.* Addit Sylveſter, (b) *Abrogatio legum tribus modis vel cauſis licitè perficitur: primò, propter conſuetudinem contrariam, 31. diſtinct. ante triennium. Secundò, propter diſparem temporum ſucceſſionem, diſtinct. 24. cap. fraternitatis, ubi dicit textus: Quod defectus noſtri temporis, quibus non ſolum merita, ſed corpora ipſa defecerunt,*

b In voce Abrogatio.

c

defecerunt, diſtrictionis illius non patitur manere cenſuram. Tertiò, propter emergentia mala, ut in cap. verum, diſtinct. 63. ubi eſt exemplum de æneo ſerpente, quem Moſes bona intentione fecit, Ezechias bona intentione deſtruxit. Idem Sylveſter, (a) enumerat leges & canones qui hodie non ligant, quæ quia nimis prolixa ſunt, deſcribere non vacat. Addit ibid. multa requiri ad hoc, ut lex habeat vim obligativam, inter quæ primum eſt. Vt ſit juſta & quidem ſecundum omnium cauſarum genera, *quia alias*, inquit, *non habet rationem legis.* Præter caſum neceſſitatis, vel illa ſola conditio deficiens diſſolvebat actus obedientiæ canonicæ, & obſervationis formalitatum atque ordinis, ad quos Reformatores tenebantur, ſive ex voto, ſive ex generali aut ſpeciali mandato Eccleſiæ, ejuſque mandati ſuſceptione. Vide regulas de *ebligatione* legum, de *Exceptionibus*, de *invalidatione & diſſolutione actuum, ad quos tenemur*, apud Sylveſtr. in voce *Lex*, imprimis apud Tartaretum in queſt. morabil. cap. 5. & 7. Et Zwarezium de legibus lib. 1. cap. 20. & lib. 4. cap. 17, 18.

a In voce Lex. 10, 11, 12. & 5, 6.

VI. Concludimus. *Primò*, Reformatoribus nulla neceſſitatis tribuit miniſterium Eccleſiaſticum: ſed vocatio ordinaria ut ſatis probatum eſt. *Deindè*, quod quidam (non omnes) alicubi in ſua Eccleſia ſimplices Presbyteri aut Parochi abſque præcedente decreto, injunctione, & communi conſilio ac directione ſuperiorum aut collateralium ſive Prælatorum, ſive Eccleſiarum, formulam doctrinæ & cultus publici mutaverint, fecerunt ex neceſſitate præcepti divini & ſalutis animarum; in quo caſu Prælati Eccleſiaſtici ſervatori Chriſto, & leges ſeu conſuetudines poſitivæ, canonicæ, legibus divinis, & charitas atque unio externa Eccleſiaſtica, charitati & unioni divinæ debebant, cedere, & ordine tantopere turbato à ſuperioribus, conſuetus ordo ab inferioribus non poterat ſervari. *Tertiò*, leges & conſuetudinees aliquas Eccleſiæ ædificationi noxias, & verbo Dei, etiam canonibus primitivæ Eccleſiæ minimè congruas, illo caſu neceſſitatis recte poſthabuerunt, quia iis extra illum caſum teneri diutius non debebant, quales plurimæ in vigore tunc erant

rant circa vocationem & functionem Paſtorum. *Quartò*, etiamſi alicubi nullus fuiſſet ordinarius miniſter qui in reformatione præiviſſet, potuiſſet in illo extremo neceſſitatis caſu Laicus quicunque donis & zelo inſtructus priuatim & publicè viva voce in ſcriptis errores detegere, viam ſalutis commonſtrare, exemplo fidelium in Eccleſia Samoſatenſi, & Flaviani ac Diodori in Antiochena (Theodoret lib. 4. cap. 14. & 3. cap. 23, 24.) quin & accedente Voto aut *συγχωρήσει* expreſſa aut tacita, ſive cleri, ſive plebis, ſive utriuſque in illa Eccleſia publicè extra ordinem & proviſionaliter prædicare ad ſupplendum defectum, donec aliter Eccleſiæ fuiſſet proviſum. *Quintò*, tali laico ab illa Eccleſia poſſet ordinarium miniſterium legitimè imponi, quamvis deeſſet & abeſſet Presbyterii aut plerorumque conſenſus, ſive propria voluntate & corruptione, ſive inevitabili neceſſitate.

To which I ſhall only adde this memorable paſſage concerning *Origen*, out of (a) *Euſebius*, and (b) *Nicephorus*, not mentioned by *Voetius*. *Origenes in Paleſtinam ſe recepit ibi quum Cæſariæ degeret Epiſcopi Paleſtini Legatione quoque ad eum miſſa, ei permiſere, ut de ſacris literis diſſereret, & publice eas in Eccleſia interpretaretur,* **quando nondum Presbyteri honorem eſſet conſequutus.** *Id quod comprobatur ex ſcriptis eis quæ Demetrius, male erga Originem affectus, Epiſcopis Paleſtinis miſit, in quibus ſcriptis, præter alia, illud erat. Nunquam ante auditum, nunquam factum eſſet, ut* **præſentibus Epiſcopis Laici Concionarentur.** *Quapropter illi, & potiſſimum Alexander Hieroſolymitanus & Theoctiſtus Cæſarienſis Antiſtites, defenſionem ejus rei ad eum ſcripſerunt,* **non vera illum dicere aſſeverantes.** *Quod autem in literis dixeris; Nunquam antè auditum, neque jam uſurpatum,* **ut laici præſentibus Epiſcopis diſputarent, ſcripturas que exponerent,** *in eo notis neſcio quo modo videris perſpicue falſa dixiſſe. Nam ubi idonei & habiles reperiuntur qui fratribus in verbo Dei adjumento ſint,* **a ſanctis Epiſcopis rogantur ut populum in verbo inſtituant, et per ſohortationes ad populum verba faciant, et id offendiculo non eſt;** *ſicut Larandis Euelpis à Neone, Iconii Paulinus a Celſo, & apud Synodos Theodorus*

a Eccleſ. Hiſt l 6. c. 20.
b Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 5. c 14. See my Epiſtle Dedicatory to Dr Coſens his Coſening Devotions.

odorus ab Attico, qui omnes beati et pii fratres erant (*nondum Presbyterii gradu potiti*) ac verisimile est, *quamvis nobis obscurum & minimè cognitum sit, illud idem in aliis locis fieri.* If therefore in the Primitive Church, within 230. years after Christ, Godly Learned Laymen (by the intreaty & exhortation of pious Apostolical Bps.) both publickly disputed, expounded the Scriptures, exhorted, preached to the people for their better edification, even in the presence of Bishops themselves, when there was no absolute necessity; Then much more might they then, and now too, do the like, and be lawfully elected, yea ordained Ministers by the people or Presbyters alone, without any Bishops concurrence, in cases of necessity, maugre all Papal or Episcopal Canons or Constitutions to the contrary; which being not ratified by any special Acts of Parliament, *are no wayes obligatory to the Clergy or people of England*, as both Houses of Parliament unanimously resolved in case of the late Canons, *Decemb.* 16, &c. 1640. without one dissenting voyce, and I have elsewhere evidenced at large, in my *Historical Collection* of the Great Councils and Parliaments of *England*; in my *Truth triumphing over Falshood, Antiquity over Novelty*; my *Historical Collection and Vindication of the antient Rights, Privileges, of all English Subjects*; and my *Breviate of the Bishops intollerable Incroachments both upon the Kings Prerogative Royal, and Subjects Liberties*, to which I shall refer the Readers for fuller satisfaction. The rather, because the Glosse on *Gratian Dist.* 96. cap. *Bene, k. Laice, & Causa* 16. *qu.* 1. cap. *Adjicimus*, Panormitan *in D. c. Decernimus*; *Summa Angellica*, *Tit.* Laicus, *sect.* 4. and other Popish Canonists assert, *That a mere Layman or Monk*, (*yea a Woman* as the * Glosse affirms, against Saint *Pauls* expresse Doctrine, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. 1 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12, 13. and Pope *Urban* the 8. his Bull for suppressing the preaching vagrant *Jesuitisses*, May 21. 1631.) *may preach to the People by the Bishops, or Priests License*; and that a Layman by the Popes Delegation may not only *preach, but also excommunicate Priests themselves as well as Laymen*: And why then in cases of late Necessity, Presbyters by the Peoples and both Houses of Parliaments consents,

* See Distinctio 23. Mulier. & Caus. 16. qu. 1.

consents, may not lawfully ordain and enable Ministers *to preach and administer the Sacraments*, as well as Popes and Popish Bishops, Priests, Authors, Laymen, Abbesses, Monks, and Persons not in Orders to preach or excommunicate; let our Bishops resolve, and satisfactorily convince us by solid Arguments and Reasons, or else for ever henceforth hold their peace, and admit our late Presbyterian Ordinations valid, both in Law and Conscience, without any future opposition.

* *His 2d. Serm. before King Edward, fol.* 38.

Our pious King *Edward* the 6. upon Bishop * *Latymers* motion before him in his Sermon, and his privy Councils Advice, there being a great want of Orthodox Learned Preachers in *England* to instruct his people, in the beginning of his Reign, did by his *Letters Patents* authorize some Learned pious Gentlemen, though not in Orders, publickly to Preach and Instruct the people in the Countries where they lived; Amongst others Mr. *Taverner*, an *Oxfordshire* Gentleman of Quality, great Piety and Learning, received a Patent from him under the Great Seal (yet remaining in his heirs custody from whom I had many years since a Transcript) to Preach the Gospel, and Instruct the people in all places, within *Oxfordshire*, *Berkshire* and *Buckinghamshire*, where he should think meet, without any impediment. By vertue whereof, he not only Preached to the people in ordinary Parish Churches in these Counties, but likewise before the Judges at the publick Assizes in the University of *Oxford* it self, when he was *High Sheriff* of *Oxfordshire*, as I have been credibly informed from some of his posterity; why therefore our Religious King *Charles* his pious *Declarations*, and the late Act for *Confirmation of Ministers in dead places, as lawfull Ministers and Incumbents*, though ordained only by *Presbyters*, without any *Episcopal Reordination*, should not likewise enable all other *Ministers* so ordained, either at home or beyond the Seas during our late Wars, to be capable of any Benefices or Ecclesiastical preferments, as they are to Preach or Baptise, without a Reordination by Bishops, as well as King *Edwards* bare Patent (without any Episcopal or Presbyterian Ordination at all) authorize Mr. *Taverner* though a Layman thus to Preach in case of necessity and want of Preachers, and that by the Statutes of 37 H. 8. c. 17. 1 Ed 6. c. 2. 1 Eliz. c. 1. 8 Eliz. c. 1. and 13 Eliz. c. 12. let our Bishops convincingly satisfie all Loyal, Peaceable Presbyterians at home, and all Protestant Churches abroad, or else retract their late Un-Brotherly, Indiscreet Excesses of this nature, which give great offence to many, and practise that Healing, Seasonable advice of the Apostle, (according to their Engagements immediately before and after his Majesties happy Restitution, which they have now forgotten) Phil. 4. 5. *Let your moderation be known to all men, the Lord is at hand*, to visit and punish them in case of disobedience.

QUEST.

QUESTION I.

VVhether Timothy was ever a Diocæsan Bishop, or first, or sole Bishop of Ephesus?

IF the multitude, or common received opinion might take place, or our * Prelates be the Judges of this Controversie, they would presently conclude affirmatively without dispute; that *Timothy* was a Diocæsan Bishop; yea, the first and sole Bishop of the *Ephesians*. But if the Scripture or verity may be umpires, it will evidently appear, that *Timothy* was no Bishop, (I mean no such Bishop as *Jure divino*, or *humano*, is different from an ordinary Presbyter in dignity and degree) much less Bishop, or first, or sole Bishop of *Ephesus*, as is generally conceived, averred by Prelatical persons; which I shall clearly evidence and make good by these ensuing Scriptures and reasons,

* Bp. Downham, Bp. White, Bp. Hall, and others.

That *Timothy* was no Bishop in this sence, is apparent.

That Timothy *was no Bishop.*

1. *First*, because S. *Paul* and *Luke*, who were best acquainted with him, and make frequent mention of him, never stile him a Bishop, neither is he once termed a Bishop in any text of Scripture. S. *Paul* in his Epistles to him, calls him, *his own Son in the faith*, 1 Tim. 1. 2. *A good* MINISTER (not a Bishop) *of Jesus Christ*, 1 Tim. 4. 6. *His dearly beloved*

ved Son, 2 Tim. 1, 2. *A good Soldier of Jesus Christ*, 2 Tim. 2. 3. *A workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word*, 2 Tim. 2. 15. In his other Epistles, he termes him, *Our Brother Timothy*, Col. 1. 1. 1 Thess. 1. 1. 1 Thess. 3. 2. 6. Phil. 2. 19. Hebr. 13. 23. *His fellow-workman*, Rom. 16. 21. *His Brother and beloved Sonne*, 1 Cor. 4. 17. 2 Cor. 1. 19. Col. 1. 1. *A workman of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 16. 10. *A servant of Jesus Christ*, Phil. 1. 1. but never a Bishop S. *Luke* terms him *Pauls Companion, Minister, attendant, and fellow-worker only*, Acts 16. 1, 2, 3. c. 17. 14, 15 c. 18. 5. c. 19. 22. c. 20. 4. never so much as intimating him to b a Bishop. The Scripture therefore never phrasing him a Bishop, nor giving him that Title, among all his other Epithites; it is an infallible argument, that he was in truth no Bishop, (such as our Bishops fancy him) but rather *an Evangelist*, as he is expresly stiled, 2 Tim. 4. 5. *Doe the works of an Evangelist.*

2. *Secondly*, Because he was S. *Pauls* Associate, Copartner, Brother, and fellow-helper in his Apostolical function, whence he often stiles him, *his Brother, his fellow-worker; and conjoynes him with him in the Prologues, inscriptions and salutations of most of his Epistles, written in both their names*, witness 2 Cor. 1. 1. c. 4. 17. 2 Cor. 1. 1, 19. Col. 1 1. 1 Thess. 1. 1. c. 3. 2. 2 Thess. 1. 1. Phil. 1. 1. c. 2. 19. Rom. 16. 21. Heb. 13 23. *Timothy* therefore being a Copartner with S. *Paul* in his Apostleship, or Apostolical function, (superior in degree to the Episcopal office, as our *Antagonists* plead and grant) as is apparent by *Ephes.* 4. 11. 1 *Cor.* 12. 18. and the general consent of all men; it is not probable that he would devest himself of his Apostolical Jurisdiction, to become an inferior Bishop, or relinquish a superior to take up an inferior degree. Who ever saw of late any Archbishop or Bishop denuding himself of his Archiepiscopal or Episcopal preeminency, to be made a poor Country Vicar or Curate? And can we then conjecture, that *Timothy* would relinquish his Apostleship for an *Ephesian* Bishoprick; or else, hold it by way of *Commendam* with his Apostleship? (**Commendaes* being not of such antiquity, and a meer late Popish innovation) or descend from an * *Evangelistship* to a Bishoprick?

* *Harris Reports, p.* 140, to 160.

* See *Gersomus Bucerus de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ, p.* 512, 513 *usque* 518.

3. *Thirdly*,

3. *Thirdly*, because *Timothy* was ever either accompanying S. *Paul* in his travels or bonds, as his fellow-helper, minister, and assistant; or else, sent by him from one Church to another, as his Messenger, Delegate, or Collegue, to establish, comfort, and instruct them; being never long resident in any one fixed place, or Church, as all Bishops were. *b* We read *Acts* 16. 1, usque 12, *That Timothy came first of all to Paul when he was at Derbe and Listra; Paul then taking him to go with him; and that they went both together through the Churches of Phrygia, Galatia, Asia, Mysia, and at last came to Philippi, where he abode with Paul, and from thence wrote and carried the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians,* as the * *Postscript* manifests. In which Epistle *Paul* writes thus unto them, 1 *Cor.* 16. 10. *Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear; for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do,* And c. 4. 17. *For this cause have I sent unto you Timothew, who is my beloved Son and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my wayes which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every Church.* By which it is apparent, that *Timotheus* was sent by *Paul* from *Philippi* to *Corinth* (with, or after this Epistle) to instruct them; Where he continuing a while, repaired again to *Paul* to *Philippi*; and there joyned with *Paul in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, written in both their names,* 2 Cor. 1. 1. informing them in the 19 verse, *That the Sonne of God Jesus Christ, who was preached among them by us, even by me, Sylvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea.* By which it is evident, that *Timothy* had before this second Epistle written, preached esus Christ among the *Corinthians* by Pauls appointment. After which *Paul removing from Philippi, Timothy accompanied him to Thessalonica and Berea, where he abode, till Paul came to Athens; from whence he sent a command to Timothy to Berea, to come to him with all speed to Athens, where he stayed for him,* Acts 17. 13, 14, 15, 16. Which he did accordingly, *joyning with Paul in the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians, written from Athens, in both their names,* 1 Thes. 1, 1. 2 Thes. 1, 1. Yea while Paul stayed at Athens, *he sent Timothy from thence to the Thessalonians, to establish and comfort them concerning their*

b See Cent Mag. l. 2. c. 10. Col. 615, 626.

* If Postscripts be of Credit as the Bishops make them.

faith, that they should not be moved by their afflictions: where he continuing for a space, came from them again to Paul at Athens, bringing him good tydings of their faith and charity, 1 Thes. 3. 1, to 7. After this, he removed with Paul to Corinth: from thence being sent into Macedonia he came again to Paul unto Corinth, Acts 18. 5. from whence Paul writing his Epistle to the Romans, remembers the salutation of Timotheus his Workfellow to the Romans, among others, Rom. 16. 21. After this Paul removing to Ephesus, sent Timotheus and Erastus (two of those who there ministred unto him) into Macedonia himself staying in Asia for a season, Acts 19. 20 From whence Paul afterwards passed in to Macedonia, and Greece, and then returning into Asia, Timotheus and others accompanied him and going before tarried for him at Troas, Acts 20. 4, 5. Whither Paul sent for the Elders and Bishops of the Church of Ephesus, giving them a strict and severe charge, to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which the holy Ghost had made them Bishops, to feed the Church of God which he had purchased with his own blood, Acts 20. 17, 28, &c. A task fitter for Timothy to enjoyn them, had he been their Diocæsan, then Paul; and a charge more meet for Timothy to receive, then they, had he then been cheif Bishop of the See of Ephesus: who being so near Ephesus, should have accompanied these Elders and Bishops of his Church to Ephesus, when Paul dismissed them, rather then have left his flock at random after so strict a charge to feed them. But yet though these Elders went back to their Cures from Miletus, Timothy did not so, for from thence he accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, Acts 21. 15, 16, 17. & from thence to Rome For the Epistle to the Colossians (written from Rome) is penned in both their names, Col. 1. 1. and the Epistle to the Hebrews, (as the Postscript and others testifie) was written to the Hebrews from Italy, by Timothy. where Timothy was for a while imprisoned, and then set at liberty, Heb. 13. 23. After which Paul writes his Epistle to the Philippians from Rome, where he was in bonds; at which time Timothy was present with him joyning in this Epistle, Phil. 1. 1. wherein he informs the Philippians, that he trusted to send Timotheus shortly unto them, that he also might be of good comfort, when he should know their estate, Philip. 2. 19. whither

* If Timotheus were then Bishop of Ephesus, why did Paul thus send him from his Cure, & Bishops See?

ther *Timothy* being sent by him, as is most probable, *Paul* wrote his *second Epistle to him, at his second appearing before* NERO, (as some affirm, and others deny) *charging him to doe his diligence to come shortly to him before winter*, 2 Tim. 4. 9. 21. he being then not at *Ephesus*, but at *Troas* or *Philippi*; as is apparent by 2 Tim. 4. 12, 13. and Philip. 2. 19. *Timothy* therefore thus ever accompanying *Paul* in his Travels and Bonds, and travelling from one Church to another by his appointment and mission, never keeping any fixed residence in any one place, much lesse at *Ephesus*, could not be a Bishop or Presbyter of any particular Church; the Apostles instituting no non-resident Bishops or Elders, but such only *as were to reside with those flocks over which the Holy Ghost had made them Bishops, or Overseers, to watch over and feed them with the bread of life, and to go in and out before them both in life and doctrine*, as Acts 14. 23. c. 20. 28, 29. c. 21. 17 18. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3. Col. 4. 17. Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8. 1 Tim. 5. 17. 2 Tim. 4. 3. Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7, 8. 1 Thess. 5. 12, 13. Heb. 13 17. John 10. 3, 4, 5, 14, 16, 27, 28. Ezeck. 34. 2, to 25. Jer. 23. 3, 4. c. 3 15. Isay 56. 10, 11. c. 40. 11. Zech. 11. 17. infallibly evidence.

4. *Fourthly*, Because *Paul*, who best knew *Timothies* condition, expressly terms him, *A Minister of God* (not a Bishop) 1 Thess. 3. 2. informing him, *that if he did put the Brethren in minde of those things he enjoyned him, he should shew himself a good Minister* (not a Bishop) *of Jesus Christ*, 1 Tim. 4. 6. Therefore certainly he was no Bishop, but a Minister, when this Epistle was written to him, unlesse it be granted, *that every Minister is a Bishop, as Paul himself doth phrase them*, Act. 20. 28. Tit. 1. 5, 7. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 1, 2, 3. Which the Opposites dare not grant, though an undoubted truth.

5. Because when *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to *Timothy*, *he was then very young in years*, 1 Tim. 4. 12. and but * *newly entred into the Ministry*: whence he charged him, to *give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, to meditate upon these things, and to give himself wholly to them, that his profiting might appear unto all men*, 1 Tim. 4. 13. 15. Instructing him in this Epistle, how and what way to preach, and how to demean himself in his Ministry, into which he

* *See* 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15.

was then but freshly entred, as most Expositors on this Epistle accord; and the 1 Tim. 1. 3. compared with Acts 16. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10. c. 18, 19, 20, 21, c. 20. 1, to 15. clearly demonstrate. *Timothy* therefore being but young in years, and newly entred into the Ministry, when this first Epistle was written to him, was questionlesse not then instituted sole Bp. of *Ephesus* by *Paul*, who in this very Epistle to him 1 Tim. 3. 6. among other qualifications of a Bp. enumerates this for one, *That he must not be a Novice* (as Timothy then was) *lest being lifted up with pride, he should fall into the condemnation of the Devil*: and so should have contradicted his own instructions to *Timothy, that a Bishop must be no Novice*, in creating him a Bishop; (which questionlesse hee would not do) being but then a Novice.

6. Because *Paul* in the 1 Tim. 5. 1. chargeth *Timothy, Not to rebuke an Elder, but to intreat him as a Father.* If *Timothy* then was not to reproove Elders as a Father over them, *but to intreat Elders, as his Fathers*, he was certainly no Lord Bishop, or Superintendent over Elders, but they rather superiours unto him, being to intreat them only as spiritual Fathers; whereas Lord Bishops and their Chauncellors too, in our dayes, esteem the very best and gravest Ministers under them, not as their Fathers, but as underlings, Vicars, or Curates to them; not entreating them as Fathers, but rating, reviling, and domineering over them as if they were their Curs, Vassals, and they their Lords and Masters paramount.

7. Because *Timothy was to account those Elders that ruled well, especially those who laboured in the word and doctrine, worthy of double honor*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. He being therefore to render double honor to those Elders that ruled well, and laboured in the word and doctrine; and not to receive double honor from them; could be no Bishop, Father, or Lord paramount over them, Mal. 1. 6. Mat. 15. 4. Rom. 13. 7. 1 Tim. 6. 1. Honor ever for the most part coming from the inferior to the superior.

8. Because *Paul* exhorts *Timothy, not to neglect the gift that was in him, which was given him by prophecy, with the laying on*

of

of the hands of the Presbytery, 1 Tim. 4. 14. Now that gift which was given him by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, was not his Episcopal function, (unlesse the opposites grant that he was consecrated Bishop of *Ephesus* by the Presbyters of *Ephesus*) but his Ministerial only: being therefore exhorted to exercise his Ministerial function only, *and to shew himself a good Minister of Jesus Christ*, 1 Tim. 4. 6, 14. not to exercise any Episcopal authority; he was questionlesse then no Diocesan Bishop, but Minister when this Epistle was compiled.

9. Because though *Timothy*, in the Postscript of the second Epistle to him, be falsely stiled, *the first Bishop of the Ephesians*, as I shall hereafter manifest, yet in the body and Postscript of the first Epistle, he is named *Timothy* only, without any mention of his *Ephesian* Bishoprick; he was therefore no Bishop either of *Ephesus* or any other place, when *Paul* sent his first Epistle to him; for otherwise he would have been stiled the first Bishop of *Ephesus* in the Postscript of the first Epistle, as well as of the second, as is probable, by the makers of these Postscripts.

10. It would not stand with the Pomp and State of a Bishop, (especially in our dayes) *to be commanded or posted up and down, from place to place, in such manner as Timothy was by Paul*, 1 Cor. 4. 7. Act. 17. 14, 15. 1 Thes. 1. 3, 1, to 7. Act. 19. 22. Phil. 3. 19. 2 Tim. 4. 9, 12. but least of all, to *carry Pauls Cloak, his Books, and Parchments after him, which Timothy is enjoyned to bring from Troas to Rome*, 2 Tim. 4. 13. An office which our proud Prelates would scorn to execute, though *Paul* himself should command them, as being incompatible with their Episcopal dignity: *Timothy* therefore being so much at *Pauls* beck, *as to be his Messenger, his Minister, his Cloack-carrier, and Book-bearer* (even when some say he was the great Monarchical Prelate of all *Ephesus* and *Asia*) was certainly no Bishop, at leastwise no such Lordly Bishop as those of this age are.

That Timothy was not Bishop of Ephesus.

2. *Secondly*, As all these several reasons evidence *Timothy* to be no Bishop, so in the next place, I shall manifest him to

to be no Bishop at all of *Ephesus*, at leastwise not the first, or sole Diocæsan Bishop of that City, and so by consequence, no Bishop at all, if not of *Ephesus*; since no other Bishoprick is assigned to him. The infallible verity whereof I shall thus demonstrate.

1. *First*, there is not one syllable in Scripture (wherin the Titles, Offices, actions of *Timothy* are frequently mentioned) which either directly, or by way of necessary consequence, imply *Timothy*, to be either a Bishop, or Bishop of *Ephesus*; which *Paul* in his Epistles to *Ephesus*, and *Timothy*, and St. *Luke* in the *Acts*, would never have pretermitted, had *Timothy* been Bishop of that famous City.

2. The Scripture makes no mention of *Timothies* being at *Ephesus*, or of his Preaching there, save only *that Paul besought* (not commanded or ordered) *him to abide still at Ephesus, whiles he went into Macedonia, that he might charge some, that they teach no other Doctrine; neither give heed to fables, and endlesse genealogies, which minister questions rather than edifying*, 1 Tim. 1. 3, 4. *and to give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, till he came thither himself, (which was but a short time after)* 1 Tim. 4. 13, 14, 15. *Paul* therefore not instituting *Timothy* any Diocæsan Bishop of *Ephesus*, but only *beseeching* (which was voluntary, not commanding) him, *to abide there*, (* *till his own return from Macedonia*,) *both to instruct the people, and to further himself in his own Studies*; not to reside there during life; it is an unanswerable argument, that he did not constitute him Bishop of *Ephesus*, as some vainly hence infer: contrary to the 1 Tim. 3. 14, 15.

* 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. c. 4. 13. *Gersomus Bucerus, De Gubernatine Ecclesiæ: p.* 502 *usque* 507.

3. When *Timothy* was thus desired to abide at *Ephesus* by *Paul*, *he was* * *but newly entred into the ministery*, as appears by the 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. c. 3. 15. compared with, *Act* 16 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12. and by the 1 *Tim.* 4. 6, 10, 12, 13, 14. Now it is not probable that *Paul* would constitute *Timothy* a Diocæsan Bishop of all *Ephesus*, yea the very first Bishop of that famous See, being but a youth, so soon as he had ordained him to be a Minister; *and before he knew how to behave himself, in the House and Church of God, which then (it seems) he did not*, 1 Tim. 3. 15.

* *Vide Chytræum Onomast. in Timotheum, & Gersomum Bucerum: Dissertat. De Gubern. Ecclesiæ p.* 506, *usque* 537.

4. *Assoon*

As ſoon as Paul returned again from Macedonia to Epheſus, he ſent Timothy into Achaia, himſelf ſtaying at Epheſus in Aſia for a ſeaſon, Acts 19. 22, to 40. *and from thence he returned into Macedonia, and through it into Aſia, accompanied with Timotheus, and others:* Acts 19. 22, to 40. after which we never read that *Timothy* writ, came or returned to *Epheſus.* Now if *Timothy* had been Biſhop of *Epheſus*, it is not probable that *Paul* upon his return from *Macedonia, would have ſent him from Epheſus into Macedonia, to Corinth, Philippi, and other Churches there,* as he did *Acts* 19. 22. c. 20. 4, 5. 1 *Cor.* 14. 17. 2 *Cor.* 1. 19. *Phil.* 2. 19. 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 1, 2, 6. or that *Timothy* would have gone from his own Epiſcopal See, into another Biſhops Dioceſs, and never returned to his own Cure of *Epheſus*, (which for ought we read he never did after his firſt departure thence) *contrary to Pauls own direction to the Biſhops of Epheſus,* Acts 20. 28.

5. We read, *that Paul ſent* Timothy *into Macedonia,* Acts 19. 22. *to preach the Goſpel to the Church of God there; that he ſent him to the Church of Corinth to bring them in remembrance of his wayes which were in Chriſt, as he taught every where in every Church, and to work the works of the Lord,* 1 Cor. 4. 17. c. 16. 10. *and that he accordingly preached Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God among them,* 2 Cor. 1. 19. That *he likewiſe ſent him to the Church of Theſſalonica, to eſtabliſh and comfort them, concerning their faith,* 1 Theſſ. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. *and after that to Philippi from Rome, that he might know the State of the Philippians, he having no man like minded, who would ſo naturally care for their ſtate as* Timothy, Phil. 2. 19, 20. But we never read that *Paul* ſent him to *Epheſus* either to comfort, exhort, confirm, inſtruct them, or to know their State after his firſt departure thence, which he would queſtionleſs have done, had he been their Biſhop, rather than thus have imployed him to other Churches. *Timothy* therefore was rather Biſhop of theſe Cities and Churches than of *Epheſus.*

6. As *Timothy* was ſent by *Paul* to the Churches of *Corinth, Philippi, and Theſſalonica, ſo he joyned with Paul in his Epiſtles written to thoſe Churches, directed to them in both their names:* witneſs 2 Cor. 1. 1. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Theſſ. 1. 1. 2 Theſſ. 1. 1.

in which Epistles *Paul makes frequent mention of Timothy:* witness, 1 Cor. 4. 17. c. 16. 10. Phil. 2. 19. 1 Thess. 3. 2, 6. Moreover *he joyns with Paul in writing to the Colossians*, Col. 1. 1. and *Paul in his Epistle to the Romans*, c. 16. 21. *remembers his salution by name to the Church and Saints of Rome*, and in his *Epistle to the Hebrews written by Timothy as his Scribe, he makes mention of his delivery out of prison by name*, Heb. 13. 23.

* Note well. * But in the Epistle to the Ephesians, *written from Rome, long after Timothy was supposed to be made first Bishop of Ephesus*, Timothy (which is most observable) neither joyns with *Paul* in the inditement or salutation, neither doth *Paul* so much as once name or mention him throughout that Epistle, as he doth in all the other Epistles to the Churches whither he sent him, and in every of his Epistles else to any Church, except in his Epistle to the *Galathians*. *Timothy* therefore doubtlesse was not Bishop of *Ephesus* at this season; else he would have vouchsafed to have joyned with *Paul* in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, as well as in his Epistles to other Churches; or *Paul* being his special Friend and applauder, would have made some honourable mention and recommendation of him to the Church of *Ephesus*, (his own peculiar Dioces as some affirm,) as he doth in his Epistles to most other Churches, where he was never Bishop. An unanswerable argument in my opinion, that *Timothy* was never Bishop of *Ephesus*, since there is no news at all either from, or of, or to, or concerning him in *Pauls* Epistle to the *Ephesians*, of whom he is surmised, to be the first, sole and genuine Bishop, by our Prelates and others.

7. If *Timothy* were Bishop of *Ephesus* when *Paul* writ his first Epistle to him, why then did *Paul himself excommunicate Hymeneus and Philetus, and deliver them unto Satan*, and not write to *Timothy* to excommunicate these Hereticks, and play the Bishop in his own Dioces, 1 Tim. 1. 20? yea why did *Paul himself*, not *Timothy lay hands upon the Disciples there ordained, after such time as he was Bishop there*, Acts 19. 1, 6.? Was it because *Timothy* was a negligent, or impotent Bishop, unwilling or unable to excommunicate Hereticks, or ordain Ministers? or in truth, because he was no Bishop then and there?

there? Not the first of these, since *Timothy* was neither negligent, nor impotent in his function: therefore the latter, he being then no Bishop, nor yet exercising his Episcopal Jurisdiction there.

8 Had *Timothy* been Bishop of *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to him, no doubt *Paul when he sent for the Elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus to take his final farewel of them, and made a solemn speech unto them*, charging them, *to take heed unto themselves and to flock over the which* THE HOLY GHOST HAD MADE THEM BISHOPS, *to feed the Church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood*, &c. Act. 20. 17. to 38. would have made some special mention of *Timothy*, and directed his speech more particularly to him by name, as being the Prime Bishop of that Church, to whom this charge did principally appertain. But *Paul* in that speech of his, makes no particular mention at all of *Timothy*, neither directed he any part of his speech to him, *he being none of the Elders of Ephesus sent for to Miletus, or any of that number whom the Holy Ghost had made Bishops of that flock and Church: he coming along with Paul out of Macedonia into Asia to Troas and Miletus*, Acts 20. 3, 4, 5. &c. and so none of the number of Elders sent for and called from *Ephesus* to *Miletus*, to whom this speech of *Paul* was applyed. Therefore questionless he was not then Bishop, much lesse sole Bishop of *Ephesus*, as some groundlesly affirm, against this unanswerable text.

9. *Paul* himself, as he sent *Timothy to Philippi, Troas and other Churches, to instruct, confirm, comfort, and inquire of their estates*, so he expressly writes to *Timothy*, 2 Tim. 4. 12. *that he had sent Tichicus unto Ephesus, for the self-same purpose* Which *Tichicus as he did write the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians from Rome, so Paul in that very Epistle of his to the Ephesians*, c. 6. v. 21. 22. acquaints them, *that Tichicus a beloved brother and faithful Minister in the Lord, should make known to them all things: whom* (saith he) *I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.* So that if there were any particular Diocesan Bishop of *Ephesus* instituted by *Paul*, this

Tychicus (whom *Dorotheus* makes *one of the* 70. *Disciples and Bishop of Chalcedon in Bithinia*) was more like to be the man, than *Timothy*, as these two Scriptures evidence.

10. *Paul* himself makes mention of *Elders in the Church of Ephesus* RULING WELL, *and labouring in the word and doctrine, and so worthy of double honour*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. Which *Elders* he expressly stiles, BISHOPS OF EPHESUS, These therefore *being instituted Bishops of Ephesus even by the Holy Ghost himself, and ruling, feeding, taking the care, and oversight of that Church by his appointment*, Acts 20. 27, 28. question lesse *Timothy* at the self-same season could not be Bishop there.

That Timothy *was neither the sole, nor the first Bishop of Ephesus.*

3. Thirdly, As *Timothy* was neither a Bishop, nor Bishop of *Ephesus*; so much lesse was he the first, or sole Bishop there, as the Postscript of the second Epistle to him, in some late Copies terms him. Not the first Bishop of *Ephesus*: For, *as that Church was first planted by St. Paul, who continued there for a season*, Acts 18. 19, 20 c. 19. 1, to 41. c. 20. 17, to 38. 1 Cor. 15. 32. c. 16. 8. 2 Tim. 1. 18. and *after that resided at Ephesus for two years and three months space together, disputing daily in the School of one* Tyrannus, *so that all they who were in Asia heard the Gospel*, Acts 19. 8, 9, 10. during which time of *Pauls* residence there (*in all 3. years*) Acts 20. 31. there needed no Bishop to govern and sway this Church, neither is it probable that any Diocæsan Bishop was there constituted: So *the two first that Paul left behind him at Ephesus at his first coming thither, to instruct that Church were Priscilla and Aquila*, Acts 18. 18, 19. *during whose abode there, while Paul went from thence to Antioch, and over all the Country of Galatia and Phrygia, in order strengthning all the Disciples; a certain Jew, named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures came to Ephesus; Who being instructed in the way of the Lord, and fervent in the spirit, spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord; and began to speak boldly in the Lord: whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded to him the way of God more perfectly*, Acts 18. 22, to 27. So that *Aquila whom Paul left first at Ephesus before* Timothy, and

and Apollos who thus preached there, may with greater reason be stiled, the first Bishops of Ephesus, than Timothy, whom *Paul intreated to stay there only at his last going into Macedonia*, Acts 22. 1. as * *most accord*. Besides, we read *that Paul at his second coming to Ephesus*, before Timothy was constituted Bishop thereof, *finding certain Disciples there, about twelve in number, who were only baptised into the baptism of John, and had not received the Holy Ghost since they believed, baptised them in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when he had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues, and prophecied*, Acts 19. 1, to 18. *Which twelve abiding at Ephesus*, as is most probable, by Acts 20. 17, 28, 29. to rule and instruct the Lords flock in that City, may more properly be termed, the first Bishops of the *Ephesians*, then *Timothy*, who as he was not the first, *so much lesse was he the sole Bishop of that See; as is infallibly evident by* Acts 20. 4, 5, 15, 17, 18, 28, 29. Where we read, *that Paul returning through Macedonia into Asia, to go to Jerusalem, to the Feast of Pentecost, there accompanied him Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus*, with others: (where *Timothy* is reckoned to be of *Derbe*, not *Ephesus*) *All these going before to Troas, accompanied Paul to Miletus; who from thence sent to Ephesus, and called to him the Elders of that Church to Miletus. And when they were come thither, he said unto them, Ye know from the first day that I came into Asia after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, &c, Take heed therefore unto your selves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made* **you Bishops** (so the * Greek, yea all Latin & most antient English translations truly render it) *to feed the Church of Christ, which he hath purchased with his own blood, &c.* From whence it is apparent:

* Bucerus De Gubern. Eccles. p. 506 usque 510 Cent. Magd. l. 1. c. 10. Col. 626.

* Ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους. *In quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit* EPISCOPOS.

First, That the Church of *Ephesus* at that time, *had not one, but many Bishops, and that by the very Institution of the Holy Ghost*: (as the Church of *Philippi* likewise then had, Phil. 1. 1.) Therefore *Timothy* could not be sole Bishop there, by *Pauls* institution, in opposition to the Holy Ghost.

Secondly, That these Bishops *knew from the first day that Paul*

Paul came into Asia, after what manner he had been with them at all seasons; and therefore in all likelihood, were appointed Bishops of *Ephesus* at the very first planting of that Church, before *Timothy* was setled Bishop: so that he was not the first Bishop there; but these rather, before, or as soon as he.

Thirdly, That *Timothy* was neither an Elder, nor Bishop of that Church at this time when *Paul* took his farewell of it: *he coming with Paul out of Macedonia to Miletus, and being none of the Elders and Bishops sent for, from Ephesus, to whom alone Paul directed his speech:* who had he then been sole or prime Bishop of that See, *Paul* would not have stiled the Elders which he sent for, *Bishops of that flock*, at leastwise he would have made some special mention of *Timothy* in this speech of his, and given him some particular instructions for the instructing and governing of that Church: or at least have honoured *Timothy* so far, as to have made him give this Episcopal charge and instruction to the Elders and Bishops of his own proper Church and Diocesse, or to have enjoyned them in special manner to reverence, honour and yield him all Canonical obedience as their supreme Diocæsan. All which *Paul* utterly neglects, or forgets to do; or particularly to charge *Timothy* to take heed to, or feed this flock, he being oft a Non-resident from it, as I have proved. Yea, *making such haste to be at Hierusalem by the feast of Pentecost*, v. 16. that he could not spare time to go to *Ephesus*, he needed not to have sent for the Elders of *Ephesus* to *Miletus* to give them these instructions, since *Timothy* their Bishop was then present with him, to whom he might and would no doubt have imparted them, without further trouble, had he then in truth been Bishop, or sole Bishop of that Church. But this sending for these Elders in this haste, and stiling them *Bishops of that flock*, and that by the *Holy Ghosts* own institution, *&c.* without any mention at all of *Timothy*, who was none of the Elders sent for from *Ephesus*, is an infallible evidence, that he was neither Bishop, nor first or sole Bishop of that City.

Fourthly, When Paul exhorted Timothy to abide at Ephesus, there were

were then in that City Elders, who did both rule well, and labour in the word and doctrine, and so were worthy double honor, 1 Tim. 5. 1. 17. 19. Now these very Elders, as *Paul* himself affirms, were made BISHOPS of the Church of Ephesus by the Holy Ghost, Acts 20. 17. 28. Therefore *Timothy* could not be the first, the sole Bishop of the Ephesians, as the false Postscript of the second Epistle to him, stiles him. Moreover, it was the Apostles manner in those times to place * many Bishops and Elders in every Church, not to constitute one Monarchical Bishop over many: witnesse Acts 11. 30. ch. 14. 23. ch. 15. 2, 4, 6, 22, 13. ch. 16. 4. ch. 20. 17, 28. ch. 31. 18. ch. 22. 5. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3. Tit. 1. 5, 7. James 5. 14. Hebr. 13. 17. Acts 13. 1, 2. 1 Cor. 14. 29, 30, 31, 32. 1 Thess. 5. 12. 15. Rom. 16. 3, 9, 12. Col. 1. 7. c. 4. 9, 12, 27. which testifie, that there were many Bishops and Elders both at Jerusalem, Corinth, Philippi, Rome, Thessalonica, Colosse, Ephesus, yea in all other Churches in Crete and elsewhere, at one time, by which the Church of God was taught and joyntly governed, as by a Common Council of Bishops and Elders, as g Irænæus, h Ignatius, Cyprian, Epist. 6. 12. 28. 46 i Ambrose, k Hierom, and l other antients testifie. Hence m Epiphanius and Eusebius testifie, that Paul and Peter were joynt Bishops of Rome at the same time; and n Tertullian writing of the Church-governors in his age, saith; Præsident nobis probati Seniores, &c. that approved Elders (not one Diocæsan Bishop) were Presidents over every several Christian Congregation; and in his book de Corona Militis, he affirms the same; The rather because it was the usual course in the Primitive times, long after the Apostles, to have divers Bishops in and over one and the same Church, not one over many Churches. Thus we read that o *Alexander* and *Narcissus* were both Bishops of *Jerusalem* at the same time; p *Paulinus* and *Miletus* both Bishops of *Antioch* together; q *Theodosius* and *Agapetus* were both Bishops of *Synada* at the same season. r *Valerius* and *Augustine* were both joynt Bishops of *Hippo* together, by the unanimous consent of the Clergy and people; *Beatus* Augustinus *Episcopo suo nondum defuncto, sed senectute gravato Cathedram Episcopalem suscepit. Qui ad majorem*

* See Gerson. Bucerus, De Gubern. Eccles. p. 302, 303, 304.

g Contra hæres. l. 4. c. 43, 44. and l. 3. c. 2.
h Epist. 5, 6, 7, 8.
i Com. in Phil. 1, 1. 1 Tit. 1. 5, 7.
k In Eph. f. 4.
l Sedulius in Tit. 1. 5.
m Contra Hæres. l. 1. Hæres. 17. Col. 88, 99.
Eccles. Hist. l. 3. c. 31.
n Apolog. contra Gentes, c. 39.
o Euseb. Eccles. hist. l. 6. c. 8. 10. in the Greek. 7. & 9. in the English.
p Socrates Eccl. hist. l. 5. c. 5. Nicephorus, lib. 12. c. 3.
q Socrates, l. 7. c. 3.
r Possidonius in vita Augustini c. 8. Cent. Magd. 4. col. 679, 680. Gratian Caus. 7 qu. 1. Epistola Paulinus ad Romam.

majorem Dominici muneris gratiam, novo more provectus, ita consecratus est, ut non succederet in Cathedram Episcopo, sed accederet. Namincolumi Valerio Hipponensis *Ecclesiæ Episcopo* CO-EPISCOPUS AUGUSTINUS EST; And when as *Augustin* was loath to be joyned a Bishop with *Valerius*, alleging it be contrary to the then Custom of the Church, to have two Bps. in one City, they replyed, *Non hoc esse inusitatum*, that this was no unusual thing, confirming this both by example of the *African*, and other forein Churches; whereupon he was satisfied So (1) *Eustathius*, Metropolitan Bishop of the *Pamphylians*, resigning his Bishoprick out of desire of peace, freedom from Troubles, labour, and to avoid the obtrectations of his Enemies, and *Theodorus* being elected in his place; was afterwards upon the Letter and Decree of the Council of *Ephesus*, restored to the name honor, and part of the profits of his Bishoprick, to hold it joyntly with *Theodorus* as his Colleague, Coadjutor and Brother, according to the dispensation and dilection which *is in Christ*, as is evident by the Letter of the Council of *Ephesus*, to the Council of *Pamphylia*; which approved of these two Bishops in one See at once. In like manner (2) *Athanasius* Bishop of *Para*, resigning his Bishoprick to avoid a sentence for the Crimes objected against him, *Sammianus* being elected in his steed against his will, he was afterwards removed by *Dioscorus* in the second Synod of *Ephesus*, and *Athanasius* restored to his Bishoprick; Upon Complaint of this Injury by *Sammianus* to the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Marcion*, and the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Sammianus* was restored upon this Condition, that if *Athanasius* should purge himself from the Crimes objected against him, and clear his innocency, they should both hold the Bishoprick together, and receive maintenance from it, till *Sammianus* should be otherwise provided for by the Archbishop of *Antioch*, as you may read at large in the 14. Session of the Council of *Chalcedon*. In the * Church of *Rome*, we know there have been sometimes two, sometimes three, and once four Popes and Bishops at one time, Some adhering to the one, some to the

(1) *Surius Concil. Tom.* 1. *p* 608, 609. *Cent. Magd.* 5. *col.* 903. 1035.

(2) *Cent. Mag.* 5. *col.* 998, 999. *Surius Tom.* 2. *p.* 188. *to* 198.

* *Platina, Baleus, Luitprandius, Albo de vitis Pontificum Theodoricus a Niem. Zabarel & Marius de Scisinate.*

the other, but all of them conferring Orders, making Cardinals, and exercising Papal Jurisdiction. In the [b] Churches of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, and *Affrick*, during the *Arrian*, *Macedonian*, *Novatian* Heresies, and Schism of the *Donatists*, there were successively two or three Bishops together in them, and other Cities at once; the one orthodox, the other heretical and schismatical. Yea the first *Council of Nice*, Canon 7. admits the *Novatian Bishops* which conformed themselves to the Church and renounced their Errors, to enjoy the title and dignity of Bishops, and to be associated with the *Orthodox Bishops*, if they thought fit. [c] *Nicephorus* and others inform us, That *Very many of the Orthodox Bishops* banished and expelled by the Arrian Emperor *Valens*, after they were recalled from their Exile, and restored to their Bishopricks by the decree of *Gratianus* the Emperor, were so moderate, courteous, Christian and compassionate to those Arrian Bishops who thrust them out, and were placed by *Valens* in their Bishopricks, that for the peace and unity of the Church, and satisfaction of the people, they were contented, and earnestly desired them to hold their *Bishopricks joyntly with them*, without any contestation for precedencie: *Nihil prorsus de prærogativa & præeminentia sedis Episcopalis contendentes, sed multitudinis concordiam quàm maximè procurantes. Quin etiam* Arrianos *qui eis ecclesiis præfecti fuerant precibus interpositis rogarunt, nè inde discederent, neve per dissentionem Ecclesiam Christi conscinderent, quam unicam existentem, atque unicam a Deo juxta & ab Apostolis traditam, dissidendi contentio* Primarumque sedium Ambitio, Hominum vanæ gloriæ studentium in multas dividit: *sed ut veram pietatem profitentes* ipsi primos Ecclesiarum Thronos retinerent, et Ecclesiam ambo administrarent. Upon which account *Miletius* who was twice thrust out of the Patriarchal Bishoprick of *Antioch* was contented to hold it joyntly with *Paulinus* the Arrian, and *Eulalius* Bishop of *Amusa* in *Pontus*, earnestly intreated the Arrian Bishop placed therein, to hold the Bishoprick joyntly with him, and to take the upper place of him, *sede honoratiore & prærogativa throni, tanquam concordiæ opinionumque conjunctionis mercede proposita, cedebat*, Ut Ecclesiam modo ambo administrarent. Which the

[b] *Eusebius, Socrates, Nicephorus, Tripartita Historia passim. Cent. Mag. 4, 5, 6, 7. c. 10. Augustinus contra Donatum.*

[c] *Eccles. Hist. l. 12, c. 3, 4. Theodoret, l. 5. c. 3, 8. Socrates l. 5. c. 5. Espencæus Digress. in 1 Tim. l. 3. c. 18. p. 360.*

Arrian refuſing out of pride and peeviſhneſſe, *was ſoon after deſerted by his Diſciples, who joyned with the Orthodox Chriſtians, being the greater number.* A memorable, ſeaſonable preſident both for our preſent reſtored Biſhops and Miniſters imitation and practice, to ſettle Chriſtian uniry, amity in our Church and State, after ſo many years bloody Wars and Schiſms; eſpecially ſeeing they all agree in the Articles and Principles of our Religion, wherein the Arrians and Orthodox Biſhops and Chriſtians much diſſented. I ſhall adde to this, that [c] St. *Auguſtine* would have the *Donatiſts Biſhops*, (where there was a *Donatiſt Biſhop* and a Catholick,) if the *Donatiſts* returned unto the unity of the Church, they ſhould be received into the fellowſhip of the Biſhops office, with the Catholick Biſhop, if the people would ſuffer it; *Poterit quippe unuſquiſque noſtrum honoris ſibi ſocio copulato viciſſim ſedere eminentius, utroque alterum cum honore mutuo præveniente. Nec novum aliquid fiet. Nam hoc ex ipſius ſeparationis Exordio in eis qui damnato nefaria diſciſſionis errore, unitatis dulcedinem vel ſerò ſapuerunt Catholica dilectio cuſtodivit*, as he there relates. Therefore this was then reputed no noveltie, but Chriſtian duty. Beſides, *Platina* [d] records of *Rhotaris* King of the *Lombards*, who declined to the *Arrians*, that in all the Cities of his Kingdom, he permitted there ſhould be two Biſhops of equal power, the one a Catholick, the other an *Arrian*; and that he placed two ſuch Biſhops in every City. [e] *Daniem* proves out of *Epiphanius*, That anciently in moſt Cities there were two or three Biſhops. [f] *Nicephorus* writes, That the *Scythians* near *Iſter*, have many and great Cities, all of them ſubject to one Biſhop; but among other people we know, there are Biſhops not only in every City, but alſo in every Village, eſpecially among the *Arabians* in *Phrygia*, and in *Cyprus* among the *Novatians* and *Montaniſts*; And *Epiphanius* writing of the Hereſie of the *Meletians*, affirms, *That in antient times*, this was peculiar to *Alexandria*, *that it had but one Biſhop*, whereas *OTHER CITIES HAD TWO.* Yea, no longer ſince then the [g] *Council of Lateran*, under *Innocent* the 3d. An. 1215. there were divers Biſhops in one City and Dioceſſe, where there were divers Nations of different Languages and Cuſtoms:

[c] *De Geſtis, cum Emerito Donatiſt. Tom. 7. pars 1. p. 781. 782. See Mr. Cartwrights Anſwer to the Rhemiſts Teſtament on Phil. 1. p. 499.*

[d] *In vita Joannis 4: & Martini 7.*

[e] *In Auguſtinum de hæreſibus, hær. 57.*

[f] *Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 11. c. 34. p. 758.*

[g] *Conc. Lat. caſ. 9. Surius Tom. 3. p. 740.*

Customs: Which though this Council disalowes where there is no necessity, yet it approves and permits where there is a necessity. Nay, *a* those Episcopal Canons, Constitutions, Decretals, which prohibit, *that there should be many Bishops in one City*, or that there should be Bishops in Castles, Villages, small Towns and Parishes, *least the dignity of Bishops should become common and contemptible*; Manifest that before these Canons & Constitutions, (made by *b Bishops themselves*) there were many Bishops in one City and Diocesse; and a Bishop in every little Castle, Town and Country Village: To come nearer home, the Statute of 26 H. 8. c. 14. ordaining, *that there should be many suffragan Bishops exercising Episcopal jurisdiction in one and the same Diocesse of England*; with the Statutes of 31 H. 8. c. 9. 33 H 8. c. 31. 34 H. 8. c. 1. which erected divers new Bishopricks in *England*, and divided one Diocesse into many, both intimate and prove as much. Why then there may not now be divers Bishops in one City, one Church, as well as there was in the Apostles times, in the Primitive Church, and former ages, or as well as there are now divers Archbishops and Bishops in one Kingdom; divers Ministers in one Cathedral and Parish Church, I cannot yet conceive; unlesse Bishops will now make themselves such absolute Lordly Monarchs and Kings, *as cannot admit of any c equals or corrivals with them*, and be more ambitious, proud, vain-glorious, covetous, unsociable, than the Bishops in the Apostles and Primitive times, whose successors they pretend themselves to be in words, though they disclaim them utterly in their Manners, Lordlinesse, Pomp, and supercilious Deportment, which they will not lay down for the peace and unity of the Church of Christ.

Since therefore the Apostles themselves ordained many Elders and Bishops in every City and in *Ephesus* too, it is neither possible, nor probable, that *Timothy* alone should be constituted sole Bishop of *Ephesus*.

Finally, it is recorded by d *Iraneus*, e *Eusebius*, f *Nicephorus*, g *Metaphrastes*, h *Hierom*, i *Chytraeus*, k *Baronius*, * and many others quoted to my hand by *Gersonius Bucerus*: *Dis-*

a *Surius Tom. 1. p. 220, 222, 226, 343, 459, 165, 414, 467, 799. Tom. 3. 740, 537.*

b *David Blondellus, Apologia pro Sententia Hieronomi sect. 3. p. 178, 179.*

c *Nec quenquam jam ferre potest Cæsarve priorē, Pompeiusq; parem.* Lucan *l. 1.*

d *Advers. Hær, l. 3. c. 3.*

e *Eccles. Hist. l. 3. c. 23.*

f *Eccles. Hist. l. 2. c. 43, 44, 46.*

g *In Lipom. De vitis Sanct. l. 1. de Johana.*

h *Catal. Script. Eccles. Johannes*

i *Onomast. in Joan.*

k *Annal. Tom. 1.*

* *August, Epist. 86.*

sertatio de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ p. 502 to 526. That St. *John* the beloved Apostle, after the Council held at *Hierusalem Acts* 15. resorted to *Ephesus*, residing, governing, and instructing that Church (which *Paul* had planted) after *Paul's* departure thence, with the Churches of *Asia* thereunto adjoyning even till *Trajanes* daies; and that though he were banished thence by *Domitian* for a season, yet after his exile he returned thither again, writing an Epistle to that Church during the time of his banishment, *Rev.* 2. 1. which he names before all the other Churches of *Asia*. If St. *John* then kept his residence at *Ephesus*, and ruled that Church by his Apostolical power, even till *Trajanes* daies; how could *Timothy* be sole Bishop and Superintendant thereof? there being no need of a Bishop, where an Apostle was present and resident to govern, by whose divine superior authority and presence all Episcopal Jurisdiction was suspended. To close up this particular point, *Petrus de Natalibus*, *l.* 1. *c.* 14. *Nauclerus Chronogr. vol.* 2. *gen.* 6. *Pantelion de viris Illustribus*, *Germ. part* 1. *Bartholomeus Anglicus in Chronica de Sanctis*: and Bishop *Usher* out of them, *De Britanicarum Ecclesiarum Primordiis*, *c.* 3. *p.* 31. record; That *Timothy* the Disciple of *Paul*, came into *Britain*, and baptized *Lucius* King thereof, with the whole Nation, and that he was Bishop of *Curie* in *Germany*, and suffered Martyrdom therein on the 3d. day of *December*. Therefore he neither was, nor continued Bishop of *Ephesus*, if this be truth. On the other hand, l *Bucolcerus*, m *Fasciculus Temporum*, the n *Century* writers, and o some others record, that *Timothy* survived St. *John*, living till about the year of Christ 108. and was then Martyred in the third Persecution under *Trajan*, or under *Nero*, or *Domitian*. If this were true, and that *Timothy* continued Bishop of *Ephesus* till his death, as the Patriots of our Prelates affirm, then by their own doctrine it will necessarily follow, *that Timothy was the Angel of the Church of Ephesus* (which they interpret to be the *Bishop of that See*) *to whom St. John writes*, Rev. 2. 1, 5. charging him, *that he had left his first love*; and therefore admonished him, *to remember*

l *Chronol. Isag.*
m *De Timotheo* n *Cent.* 1. l. 2. c. 10. Col. 626.
o *Niceph* l. 3. c. 72. *Vincentius' Spec. Hist.* l. 38. c. 10

whence

whence he was fallen to repent, and do the first works, &c. But it is not credible nor probable, that *Timothy*, a man so pious, so laborious, so vigilant, and so much applauded by *Paul* in most of his Epistles, should be this backsliding Angel of the *Church of Ephesus*, which (to omit all other *a Commentators*) the contents of *our authorized Bibles* of the last translation, affirm *to be the Ministers* (not the Bishops *of that Church*, as some Apostatizing Prelates glosse it, against Acts 20. 28, 29, 30.) therefore from thence, and all other the premisses, I may now safely conclude, that *Timothy* was not a Bishop, nor yet the first, sole or any Diocæsan Bishop of *Ephesus*, as our Prelates groundlesly affirm; whose allegations to the contrary I shall next propose and refell, that so the truth may be more perspicuous.

a *Beda in Apoc. 1. and 2. Aretas in Apocal. 2. & 3. Ambros Ansbert in Apoc. l. 2. & Primasius in Apoc. 2. Brightman, Gersomus Bucerus De Gubern. Eccles. p. 105, 393, 408, 419, 422, 433, usque 466. 472, 484, 485.*

Object. 1. The first allegation to prove *Timothy* a Bishop when *Paul* writ the first Epistle to him, *is the Postscript of the second Epistle*, which runs thus; *The second Epistle unto Timotheus, ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time.* Hence *b Bishop White and others*, conclude *Timothy* to be a Bishop.

b *Preface to the Treatise of the Sabbath. Bishop Downham in his consecration Sermon, and Bishop Hall since.*

Answer. To which I answer; *First*, that this Postscript is no Scripture, and all others (as in *c* Mr. *Perkins* works is proved at large) no part of the Epistle, no Appendix of St. *Pauls*, but a private observation annexed to it, by some Expositor, Scribe, or other, after the Epistle written, without any divine inspiration; as the words themselves demonstrate; *The SECOND Epistle unto Timotheus ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time.* Where observe; First, that this Postscript is written, not in the name of *Paul*, *but of some third person*, as the whole frame of it demonstrates.

c *Comment on Gal. 6. p. 497, 498, 499.*

Secondly, that this Postscript is no direction given by *Paul* to *Timothy*; as the words (*the second Epistle to Timotheus, ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians, was written, &c.*) evidence, but a direction of some Notary or *Commentator* to the Reader, who here speaks both of *Paul* and *Timothy* in the third person. *Thirdly*,

* *Perchance Theodoret. the first in whom I find any Postscripts, 430. years after Christ.*

Thirdly, the words *WAS WRITTEN*, *&c.* in the preterperfect tense, shews this Postscript to be a meer addition of some Scribe or Expositor, some good space after the Epistle written, not of *Paul* himself, at the time when he writ it; all the Postscripts of his other Epistles appearing manifestly not to be his, by the same reason.

Fourthly, it is here called, *the second Epistle unto Timotheus*, in relation to the *first*; and the first Epistle to him, written many years before it, is likewise stiled in the Postscript of it, *the first to Timothy*, with reference to the second. As therefore the Postscript of the first Epistle was certainly added by some Notary after the second Epistle written, since it is called the first in relation to it: so no doubt the Postscript of the second Epistle was annexed to it after the first Epistle, and the second was transcribed and bound up together, by the same party that added the Postscript to the first; the Postscript stiling them thus, the 1, and 2. in regard of their mutual relation one to the other, after they were both conjoyned, and the new Testament and *Pauls* Epistles, digested into that order and method, wherein now they are placed, both in manuscripts and printed Copies.

Fifthly, it is very unlikely, that *Paul* would make such a Postscript as this. For as these words (*was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time*) sound not of *Pauls* language, but some others; so the second Epistle unto *Timotheus ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians*, savour not of his inditing; who never in any of his Epistles to him or others stiles him a Bishop, much lesse *ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians*, neither would he have made such a description of *Timothy* as this, to Timothy himself.

Sixthly, *None of the other Apostles have any Postscripts added to any of their Epistles*; it is likely therefore that *Paul* guided by the same Spirit, added none to all, or any of his, but that they * were added by some other, who either transcribed and collected his Epistles together, or commented on them; as were the several Titles both before and over his several Epistles, and the contents before each Chapter, both in

* *See Mr. Perkins comment. on Gal. 6. p. 497. 498, 499. where this is largely proved.*

in manuscripts, and printed Copies.

Seventhly, it is apparent, that the Postscripts of many of *Pauls* Epistles are forged and false, as * Mr. *Perkins* in his works *Baronius* and *Beza* prove them; and that the Postscript of the first Epistle was written not only after the second penned, but likewise three hundred years after Christ or more. For it runs thus, *The first to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* Now *Phrygia* was not surnamed *Pacatiana* (as * *divers affirm*) *by any Historians or Geographers till at least three hundred years after Christ; from one Pacatius, a General, as is conceived who subdued it.* Since therefore it was so stiled till about two hundred years after Christ, this Postscript must needs be added after that time; and so in all likelihood the Postscript of the second Epistle too, being both made by the same author, at the same time; and the first, first, both in time and order, as is most probable; neither would *Paul* doubtlesse make such a Postscript to tell *Timothy*, that *Laodicea was the chiefest City of Phrygia Pacatiana*, it being so near to *Ephesus*, and as well known to *Timothy* as to *Paul*. Who as * *the Rhemists and Baronius confesse, was never at Laodicea*, which they prove by *Gal.* 2. 1. and so this Postscript is but a meer falsitie.

Eighthly, This Postscript is directly contrary to the very preface and body of the Epistle, written no doubt by *Paul*; which as it expressly stiles *Timothy an Evangelist*, not a Bishop; *exhorting him to make full proof of his Ministry*; not of his Bishoprick, c. 4. v. 5. So *Paul* therein, and in the first Epistle, ever terms him, *his dearly beloved Son*, 2 Tim. 1. 2. c. 2. 1. 1 Tim. 1. 2, 18. *A man of God*, 1 Tim. 6. 11. 2 Tim. 3. 17. not a Bishop: and in the 2 Tim. 4. 12. but a little above the Postscript, *Paul* writes expressly to him. *That he had sent Tychicus to Ephesus to know their affairs, comfort their hearts, and make known to them all things. He being a beloved brother and faithful Minister in the Lord*, Ephes. 6. 21, 22. and neither *Timothy* his Curate and underling, much lesse his Successor at *Ephesus*, as is probable.

Ninthly, This Postscript is directly contradictory to many

* *Comment on Gal.* 6 p. 497, 498, 499.

* *See Tripart. Hist. l.* 11 c. 3. *Theodoret. Eccl. Hist. l.* 4 c. 7. *the title of the chapter Socrat Eccl. Hist l* 7c. 3. *Niceph. Eccl. Hist. l.* 14. *c.* 11. (*the first who stile it Pacatiana*) *and those who have lately commented on, and written against this Postscript Surius Con. Tom.* 1. p. 453. *Tom.* 2. 3. p. 11, 12, 221. 438, 461, 479, 480, 483, 488, 413, 499, 503, 505, 520, 553, 580, 589, 599, 601. *Carolus Sigonius de occidentali Imperio, l.* 3. p. 90. *Cambdens Britania.* p. 75.

* *Mr. Perkins Comment. on* 1 *Gal.* 6. p. 497. 798, 799.

ny fore-alleged Scriptures, which prove *Timothy* to be no Bishop, much lesse the first or sole Bishop of the Church of the *Ephesians*; therefore not to be believed, See *Act.* 20. 28.

Tenthly, The Postscript it self, but especially the clause of it, (*ordained the first Bishop of the Ephesians*) whereon this objection is grounded, is but a late addition, not extant in any of the Fathers works who have commented on this Epistle, (except *Oecumenius*, who lived 1050. years after Christ; the first in whom this clause of the Postscript is found) nor in the most antient, best *Greek*, *Latin*, *Arabick*, *English*, *or other Copies and Translations*, *whether manuscript*, *or printed*, (of which more anon) therefore to be rejected, as counterfeit coyn.

d Eccles. Hist. l. 3 c. 4. as Meredith Hammer, an English Bishop Englished it in his English Translation of Eusebius.

Eleventhly, d *Eusebius* writes, *that Timothy* WAS REPORTED TO BE, (not that he veryly was) *the first Bishop of Ephesus*; therefore this Postscript either was not in being in his age, or else it had no more credit then a bare report, not sufficient to resolve that *Timothy* was undoubtedly of a truth Bishop of *Ephesus*: The first who makes mention of any of these Postscripts is *Theodoret*, 430. years after *Christ*, who perchance then added them to *Pauls* Epistles; but in his Postscripts this clause (*ordained the first Bishop of the Ephesians*, with that of Titus, *ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*) cannot be found.

e 2 Tim. 4. 6, 7, 8, 9. with all Expositors on this Epistle and the Postscript of it, if of any force or truth.

Secondly, Admit this Postscript true, and authentical, that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus* when this second Epistle was written, being but a e *little before Pauls death*, yet this is no good proof, that he was Bishop of *Ephesus*, when the first Epistle was penned, being some 10. or 12. years before, as most conjecture; for if it be a good argument, That *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, when the second Epistle was written to him; because the Postscript of it only stiles him so: it is as good or a better argument for me to say, that *Timothy* was no Bishop of *Ephesus* when the first Epistle was directed to him, because neither the body nor Postscript of that Epistle, nor any other Scripture whatsoever, stiles him, either a Bishop, or Bishop of *Ephesus*, *though he* * *was resident at Ephesus*, *when the first Epistle was written*

* 1 Tim 1. 3, 4.

written to him; * *but not when the second was sent him*; and so should much more have been stiled a Bishop, in the first Epistle and Postscript, than in the second. Now all the Prelates and Papists arguments, by which they would prove *Timothy* a Bishop, are drawn from his first Epistle, (which *Ludovicus Capellus*, *Baronius*, and others acknowledge to be written many years before *Paul* went to *Rome*, or *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*) not from his second; the Postscript therefore of his second Epistle is no argument to prove, that he was a Bishop when the first Epistle was written: for why then should not the Postscript of the first Epistle, stile him a Bishop as well as the second? yea, rather than the second? since the first hath much matter in it, both concerning the offices and qualities of a Bishop, the second very little, or nothing, save only of f *diligent and constant preaching, in season and out of season*; which belongs indifferently to all Bishops and Ministers, and is so far from being proper and peculiar to Bishops in these dayes, that it is hardly common to or with any of them; Rare to most of them, and altogether improper for some of them, who g *like the dunstical Bishop of Dunkellden, think it no part of their Episcopal Office, and that they were never so much as ordained to preach, but rather to sit mute, and domineer like Lords, and that preaching belongs only to Curates, and inferiour Ministers, not to Lordly Prelates*, who seldom climb now into a Pulpit above once a year, whereas *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Ambrose*, *Cyril*, *Hooper*, and other Bishops, antiently preached once at least every day.

* 2 *Tim.* 4.12. *Ephes.* 6.21,22.

f 2 *Tim.* 4.1,2.

g *Fox Acts and Monuments, p.* 1153. *Nicolaus de Clemangiis de Corrupto Eccl. Stat. c.* 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. *Bishop Latymers Sermon of the Plough. See the Rhemists in their Preface to this Epistle.*

Obj. 2. The second objected allegation is this; *that* Paul *describes to* Timothy *the office, qualities, carriage, and duties of a Bishop, instructing him how to demean himself in that office,* 1 Tim. c. 3. c. 4, and 5. *therefore he was a Bishop.*

Answer 1. To this I answer: first, that *Paul by a Bishop in this Epistle, means no Diocæsan Bishop in dignity and degree above a Presbyter, but only such a Bishop as was equal, the same, and no wayes different from an Elder*; *as all the* h *Fathers and most modern Expositors on this and other texts accord.* Such a Bishop I acknowledge *Timothy* to be, and so this instruction to

h *Hieron, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Sedulius, Primasius, Theodoret, Theophilact, Remigius, Rabanus Maurus, Anselmus, Oecumenius, Alensis, Lombard, Bruno, with all late Expositors on* 1 *Tim.* 3. *Phil.* 1. 1 *Tit.* 1, 5, 7. *Acts* 20. 17, 28. *and Mr. Cartwright in his Answer to the Rhemists Preface.*

him implyes; but that he was a Diocæſan Biſhop, ſuperior in dignity to, or different in order from a Presbyter, this text and argument cannot evidence.

Secondly, Admit it meant of a Diocæſan Biſhop, yet it follows not thence, that *Timothy* was ſuch a one: this *Epiſtle being written rather to inſtruct others than* Timothy, who was ſo well tutered before, both by his Grandmother *Lois*, and *Paul*, 1 Tim. 6. 12, 20. c. 4. 6, 14, 16. 2 Tim. 1. 5, 6, 13, 14. c. 2. 2. c. 3 10, 14, 15. *but for a pattern of the qualification and duty of Miniſters, to direct the Churches in all future ages*, (who have inſerted it into their Canons, Pontificals, and forms of Ordinations or Conſecrations of Biſhops and Miniſters) *rather then to inform* Timothy *at that time: whence in both theſe Epiſtles there are ſome predictions of the Apoſtacy and Degeneracy of the laſt times*, more neceſſary for i *others ſince, than* Timothy *then, to know*, 1 Tim. 5. 24, 25. c. 6. 15. c. 4. 1, to 7. 2 Tim. 3. 1, to 10.

i *Non ſolum Timotheum ſed & omnem per hocad monet Epiſcopum, Oecumenius in* 1 *Tim.* 5. 1.

Thirdly, There are in the ſame Chapter inſtructions given, *concerning Deacons, Widows, and others*; yet *Timothy* was neither Deacon nor Widow; which being neceſſary for the Church of God, and for *Timothy* alſo to know, as he was an Evangeliſt, a Fellow-helper and Aſſiſtant of *Paul* in his Miniſterial and Apoſtolical function, and as his delegate to order and regulate the Church accordingly, argue him to be no more a Biſhop, as is ſurmiſed, then that every *Miniſter and Chriſtian, for* k *whoſe inſtruction and direction this Epiſtle was written, as well as for* Timothies, are Biſhops; or then any Archbiſhops, or Biſhops inſtructions to their Archdeacons, Vicars Generals, Chancellors or Officials for Eccleſiaſtical affairs, or Viſitations, argue them to be Archbiſhops or Biſhops.

k 2 *Tim.* 3. 6. 1 *Tim.* 6. 1, to 21.

Fourthly, We read of divers books, concerning the Office and Regiment of Kings, Magiſtrates, War, dedicated to young Princes, and others who were neither Kings, Magiſtrates, nor Captains; of divers tractates concerning Biſhops, inſcribed to ſuch who were no Biſhops; yet the dedicating of ſuch Treatiſes to them, did neither conſtitute nor neceſſarily imply them to be Kings, Magiſtrates,

Captai

Captains, Bishops. Why then should this Epistle to *Timothy*, wherein are some things concerning the Office, Qualities, and Duties of a Bishop, prove him convincingly to be such a one.

Obj. 3. The third evidence to prove *Timothy* a Bishop, is taken from the 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. Where he is enjoyned, *to lay hands suddainly on no man*; that is, to ordain no man suddenly, a Minister. Therefore certainly he was a Bishop, because none but Bishops have power to ordain Ministers.

Answ. 1. I answer first. that the laying on of hands hath divers significations in Scripture. Sometimes, it is taken, *for an apprehension of another as a Malefactor, to punish, or bring him to judgement for his offences*, Exod. 24. 11. Esther 8. 7. Gen. 37. 22. Exod. 6. 1. Nehem. 13. 21. Luke 21. 22. in which sence it may be well taken here, as the preceding verses evidence. Othertimes it is used for *reconciliation of persons at variance*, Iob. 9. 33. Sometimes for *benediction* or blessing of *another*, Mat. 9. 15. Sometimes for *curing and healing*, Mark. 5. 23. Mat. 19. 18 Mark. 6. 5. Luke 4. 40. Sometimes for *confirmation*, as many affirm, Acts 8. 17, 18, 19 Sometimes for *ordination*, as Acts 6. 6. cap. 8. 17, 11. cap. 13. 3. 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 19. Acts 19. 6. In which of these sences it is here meant is * *not certainly resolved*, and so no inference can be infallibly raised thence.

* *Divus Basilius ita interpretatus est, quasi nihil huius capitis ad ordinationem pertineat. Oecumenius in 1 Tim. 5. 22.*

Secondly, Admit it meant of ordination, as most conceive it; yet that proves not *Timothy* to be a Bishop, since not only *Apostles, Evangelists, and the Apostles fellow-helpers had power of ordination, as they were such*, Acts 1. 22, 25. 26. c. 6. 6. c. 8. 17, 18. c. 13. 1, 2, 3. c. 14. 23 c. 19. 6. Tit. 1. 5. 2 Tim. 1. 6. but even *Presbyters themselves*: Acts 9. 17. c. 13. 1, 2, 3. c. 14. 23. 1 Tim. 4. 14. and *Timothy* might exercise this power in all or either of these respects, not as a Bishop, which for ought appears he never was; neither read we in Scripture that ordination belongs of right to Bishops, as Bishops; much lesse, that it is appropriated unto them. Of which more fully hereafter.

Obj. 4. The fourth Objection to prove *Timothy* a Bishop, is this; *that he is commanded to rebuke such as sinned openly be-*

fore all men that others might fear, 1 Tim. 5. 20. Therefore he was a Bishop.

Answ. I answer, that the argument is an inconsequent.

First, Because he might do this as an Evangelist, or as *Pauls* associate or substitute, by vertue of his Apostolical authority, not of his own Episcopal Jurisdiction, as Bishops Officials, Chancellors and Vicars General, rebuke, correct, and visit others, not in their own names, or by their own authority, but their Lord Bishops.

Secondly, He might do this as a Minister, *every Minister having power sufficient in the publique Ministery of the word, openly to rebuke all sins and sinners*, Isaiah 58, 1, &c. Ezech. 2. 2 Tim. 4. 2, 3. Tit. 1. 13 c. 2. 15. Mark 6. 18, 19, 20. 2 Sam. 12, 7.

Thirdly, He might do this as a private Christian; every Christian being enjoyned *in any ease to rebuke his Neighbour, and not to suffer sin upon him*, Levit. 19, 17. Prov. 9. 8. Eccles. 2. 5. *and so is every Magistrate to do*, Nehem. 13. 11, to 31. Psal. 141. 5. Ps. 101. 5. 8. This therefore is no argument of any Episcopal Jurisdiction; the rather, because this rebuke was to be *publickly in the Church before all*, not in a private Chamber or Consistory Court, (as all expositors accord) in which our Bishops pronounce their Censures.

Obj. 5. The fift argument to prove *Timothy* a Bishop, is the 1 Tim. 5. 19. *Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.* He had power to receive an accusation against Ministers, that so he might correct them; therefore he was a Bishop.

Answ. I answer first, that this is a meer *Non sequitur.*

For 1. He might have this power, to receive such an accusation as an Evangelist, and *Pauls* Coadjutor,

Secondly, , As *Pauls* Delegate or Official; as our Bishops Officials, Vicars and Chancellors now exercise Episcopal Jurisdiction under them; as their substitutes only, not by any inherent Episcopal dignity or authority in themselves.

Thirdly, He might do it by the appointment and mutual consent of the people, *who had power in any differences, to constitute any man a Judge, though no Bishop*, 1 Cor. 6. 1, to 7.

Fourthly, He might do it only as an Elder; *Elders having*

power

power to rule well, 1 Tim. 5. 17. and so by consequence, to receive *accusations*, * *and to correct Delinquents by reproofs or Ecclesiastical Censures, with the consent of the Congregation*, 1 Cor. 5. 4, 5, 11, 12. c. 6. 1, to 7. Gal. 6. 1. 2 Thess. 3. 14, 15. Mat. 18. 17.

* *See Gerson us Bucerus, & Mr. Rutherfords due Right of Presbyteries.*

Fiftbly, I had almost added, that he might have done it as an Ecclesiastical high-Commissioner, but that I considered, he was not so much as *to receive an accusation, against an Elder, but under two or three witnesses at least*, first examined; and *our Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Bishops are so far* from this divine Apostolical precept, by which they would prove *Timothy* and themselves to be Bishops *Jure divino, that they will pursevant, silence, suspend, imprison Ministers, Elders, and put them to self-accusing* * *ex officio oathes, upon every apparitors jealousie, suspition, and private accusation of any Drunkard, Rascal, without two or three witnesses or accusers, first examined against them, and brought face to face.* A direct proof, that neither they nor their present proceedings are *Jure divino*.

* *Conference at Hampton Court, p. 89. 90. Melvini Celsæ commissionis Anatomia. Fullers argument, 1607. The Petition of Grievances 7. Jacobi.*

Answ. 2. *Secondly*, I answer, that by *Elder* in this Text, as * *many conceive*) is not meant a Presbyter, or Minister, *but an antient man*, as it is taken in the *first verse of the Chapter*: so as it proves not, that *Timothy* had any Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over the Elders that were Ministers of *Ephesus, who ruled that Church*, v. 17. and *were the Bishops of it*, Act. 20. 28. Where *Paul* enjoyns them, *to take heed to themselves*; as having no superintendent paramount them; not giving *Timothy* any charge to take heed of them.

* *Chrysost. Theodoret. Theophilact. Oecumenius, and others on this text. The Brethren of London in K. Henry the 8. his dayes in their Letter to Thomas Phillips. Fox Acts and Monuments, p. 951.*

Thirdly, Admit these Elders were Ministers, yet *Timothy* had no judiciary power over them, to suspend or correct them: since *v.* 1. he is expresly enjoyned, *not to rebuke an Elder, but intreat him as a Father*: which is far from giving him any such Episcopal Jurisdiction over them as our Bishops now exercise and usurpe; using godly Ministers and rating and treating them, rather like dogs and scullions, than Elders, and Fathers.

Fourthly, The words are not, that he should not excommunicate, suspend, convent or censure an Elder, but *that he should not receive an accusation against him, but before two or three*

three witnesses. Now to condemn or censure, is one thing, to receive an accusation, another. The first none but a Judge or chief Officer can do; the second, every Register, Clerk, Informer, Atturny, or under Officer* Yea, *every private Christian is capable to receive an accusation, and every ordinary Minister too, against another superior to him in age, estate, or age, either privately to admonish him that is accused, of his fault, or to reprove him for it; or to councel him how to repent and redress it; or to comfort him if he be dejected with it, or to inform against him to the Magistrate, or whole Congregation if obstinate, or to pray to God for his amendment,* Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17. Levit. 19. 17. Gal. 6. 1. 2 Thess. 3. 14, 15, 1 Tim. 5. 20. 24. Tit. 1. 10. to 14. 2 Johan. 10. 11. Jude 22. 23 which well expound this text.

* See Davidis Blundelli Apologia, Sect. 3, 4.

Fifthly, The true meaning of this text is [illegible], that *Timothy* and other Christians of what quality soever, especially Ministers, should not lightly receive or believe any ill report, chifly of an Elder or Minister, without sufficient testimony of the truth thereof by two or three able witnesses; as will plainly appear by paralelling it with Psal. 15 3. Numb. 35. 30. Deut. 17, 6. c. 19. 15. 17. Heb. 10. 28 and with Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17. where our Saviour saith thus. *Moreover, if thy Brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy Brother: But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee two or three more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the Church, and if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican,* A perfect Commentary on this text of *Paul,* and a direct censure of our Bishops ex officio Oathes, and proceedings by the parties own self-accusing Oath and answer, without or before witnesses produced.

Sixthly, This text (admit it gives power to *Timothy* to take an accusation against an Elder before two or three witnesses;) yet it excludes not the other Elders of *Ephesus* from having like power with him; it given him not any sole power to hear and determine complaints without the other Elders

Elders assistance or consent, * *but together with them* Mat. 18. 17. 1 Tim. 5 17. Act. 20. 28. Hence the *fourth Council of Carthage*, Can. 23, 29, and 66. and after it *Gratian Caus.* 15. *Quest.* 7. *Cap. Nullus*, Decree, *That a Bishop should hear no mans cause without the presence of his Clerks; and that the sentence of the Bishop should be void, unlesse it were confirmed with the presence and assent of the Clergy.* Which is likewise ordained, affirmed, yea practised by Concil. *Carthaginense* 2. cap. 10. and 3 Can. 7, 8, 37. by *Egbert* Archbishop of *York*, in his Exceptions about the year 750. cap. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48. *Spelmanni* Concil. Tom. 1. p. 263. *Vasense* Concil. cap. 5. *Aurelianense* Concil. 3. cap. 20. & 4. cap. 9. *Rhemense* Anno 639. cap. 5. Concil. *Turonis* Anno 567. cap. 7. Concil. *Hispalense* 2. cap. 6. *Toletanum* Concil. 12. cap. 6. Tol. 13. cap. 11. Tol. 16. c. 2. And also by *Tertullian*, Apologia cap. 29. St. *Cyprian* Epist. 6. 22, 28, 46. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Strom. l. 7. *Origen* Homil. 11. in Exodum & Homil. 7. in *Josh. Basil.* Epist. 75. *Ambrose* Epist. l. 20. Epist. 80. ad Syagrium. *Ruffinus* Hist. l. 10. cap. 9. Cyril. Epist. ad Johannem Antiochenum; *Gregory* Epist. l. 11. Epist. 49 *Hierom* Epist. ad Demetriadem and others. Yea, *Gratian Caus.* 15. *Quest.* 7. proves out of the *Councils of Hispalis, Agatha the first, Carthage the second and fourth, and Gregory* (whose words and Canons he recites at large) *that a Minister, Presbyter, or Deacon cannot be punished, or deprived by the Bishop alone, but by a Synod or Council, and that the Bishop cannot hear or determine the causes of Clergy men alone, without associating the Elders of the Church, or other adjoyning Bishops, with him*; for which *cause* * *many antient Councils* decreed, *that there should be two Councils kept, in each Province every year, to hear and determine all Ecclesiastical causes and controversies.* This text therefore proves nothing for *Timothies* Ecclesiastical or Episcopal Jurisdiction, *being written rather for the Churches, and Ministers future, then Timothies present instruction*, as ||*Gersomus Bucerus* rightly observes. Finally learned * *Doctor Whitaker* hath long since assoyled this objection in these words: *That Timothy is commanded not rashly to admit an accusation against an Elder, this proves not, that Timothy had power*

* *See Davidis Blondelli Apologia, Sect.* 4. *Smectimnuus, Mr. Rutherfords due right of Presbyters.*

* *Concilium Antiochenum, Can.* 20. Gratian *Distinct.* 18. *Conc. Aphricanum. Can.* 18: *Chalcedonense, Can* 19. *Nicenum Can.* 5 *Toletanū* 3 *Can.* 18. *Synodus Francica. Anno* 742 *Conc. Metense, Can.* 32. *with many others.*

|| *Dissertatio de Gubern. Eccles. p.* 506, 507, 508.

* *Controv.* 4. *Quest.* 1. *c.* 2. *Sect.* 16.

er or dominion over Elders. For according to the Apostles mind, to receive an accusation, is to bring a crime to the Church, to bring the guilty person into judgement, openly to reprove, which not only Superiors may do, but also equals and inferiors. In the Roman Republick, Knights did judge not only the people, but also the Senators, and Patricii. And certainly it seems not that Timothy had such a Consistory or Court, as was afterwards appointed to Bishops in the Church. What this authority was, may be understood by that which follows; Those that sin rebuke before all, which equals also may do. Thus Bishops heretofore, if any Elder or Bishop had an ill report, referred it to the Ecclesiastical Senate or Synod, and condemned him, if he seemed worthy by a publick judgement, that is, they did either suspend, excommunicate or remove him. The Bishop condemning nocent Elders and Deacons, not with his own authority alone, but with the judgement of the Church and Clergie. Those who were thus condemned, might lawfully appeal to the Metropolitan; but he could not presently alone determine what seemed good to him, but permitted the Synod to give sentence, and what the Synod decreed was ratified. The same Answer Martin Bucer. De vi & usu S. Ministerii, Dr. Andrew Willet Synopsis Papismi. Cont. 5. Gen. Quest. 3. part 3. in the Appendix, and Gersomus Bucerus De Gubernat. Ecclesiæ * page 300, to 398. (where this objection is most fully cleared by Councils, Fathers, and other authors testimonies) give unto this place: so that it makes no proof at all, that Timothy was a Bishop. From all these premises I may now safely conclude, that Timothy was neither a Bishop, nor Bishop of Ephesus, nor first, nor sole Bishop of that See, as many overconfidently, and erroneously affirm.

* Vide p. 490. usque 524. and David Blondellus. Apologia pro sententia Hieronimi de Episcopis & Presbyteris Sectio. 3.

Obj. 6. If any in the fixt place object, that * divers of the antient Fathers, as Dionysius Areopagita, Hierom, Ambrose, Dorotheus, Theodoret, Chrysostome, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Gregory the great, Policrates, Primasius, Isidor Hispalensis, Beda, Anselm, Rabanus Maurus, Oecumenius, with many modern writers affirm, Timothy to be Bishop, and first Bishop of the Ephesians; therefore he was so.

* See Gersomus Bucerus p. 518, 519.

Answ. I answer first, that as some of these Fathers are spurious, and not to be credited, so many of their testimonies are

are ambiguous, if not contradictory. p *Eusebius* writes, *that Timothy* IS REPORTED *to be the first Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of the Church of Crete:* which is rather a denial than an affirmation that he was Bishop there in truth. * *Theodoret* and *Beda* affirm him, to be *Bishop of all* Asia, *not of* Ephesus *only, and so an Archbishop rather than a Bishop.* Their Testimonies therefore being so discrepant and dubious, are of no validity.

p Eccles Hist. l. 3 c. 4. as Meredith Hanmer, an English Bishop Englisheth it.

* In 1 Tim. 3.

Secondly, * *Many of the Fathers affirm Peter to have been Bishop of Rome, and to have continued Bishop there for divers years;* yet q *Marsilius Patavinus,* r *Carolus Molinæus, with sundry* ſ *other late Protestant Writers,* both forein and domestick, affirm, and substantially prove by Scripture and reasons, *That Peter was never at Rome, nor yet Bishop thereof.* As therefore their bare authorities are no sufficient argument, to prove *Peter* Bishop of *Rome,* (the foundation of the Popes Supremacy) so neither are they sufficient to evince *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus,* the ground-work of our Bishops Hierarchy.

|| *See* Dr. Reynolds *conference with* Hart, *p.* 213

q *Defensor Pacis, pars* 2. *c.* 16. *Ulricus Velenus Petrus non venisse Romam, neque illic passus est*

r *Senatus Consultus* Franciæ, *contra abusus, &c. Paparum, p.* 162, *to* 172.

ſ Dr. Reynolds *conf. with* Hart, *c.* 6. *div.* 3 *p.* 210 *to* 218. *Balæus in Act. Pontif. l.* 1. *Præfatio.* Chr. Carlile *his* S. Peters *Life & Peregrination, proving that* Peter *was never at* Rome. R. Bernard *his fabulous foundation of the Popedom.* * *Fox Acts and Mon. p.* 1465. G *Buc. de Gub. Eccl. p.* 432. *to* 500, 519, 520, *to* 540.

Thirdly, These Fathers affirm not *Timothy* to be sole Bishop of *Ephesus,* or to be a Diocæsan Bishop, or such a Bishop as is superiour to a Presbyter in Jurisdiction or Degree, the thing which ought to be proved; and if they affirmed any such thing, yet seeing the fore-alleged Scriptures contradict it in a most apparent manner, they are not to be credited against the Scriptures testimony.

Fourthly, The Fathers term him Bishop of *Ephesus*; not because he was any sole Diocæsan domineering Bishop there, as the objectors pretend; but because he was *left by* Paul *to teach and instruct them for a space, till he returned from* Macedonia, and to order that Church joyntly with the other Bishops and Elders thereof; and being one of the eminentest Pastors of that Church, next after *Paul,* who planted it, the Fathers term him, *the Bishop of Ephesus,* in that sence only as they stiled *Peter Bishop of Rome and Antioch, James Bishop of Jerusalem, Mark Bishop of Alexandria, and the like;* (* *not that they were Bishops properly so called,* or such as ours are now, but only in a large and general ap-

pellation, because they first preached the Gospel to these Churches) And that to no other purpose, but to prove a perpetual succession of Presbyters, and doctrine in those particular Churches, from the Apostles time till theirs, naming the eminentest Minister for parts and gifts in each Church, the Bishop of that Church; all which appears by t Irenæus, u Tertullian, and x others; who call them Bishops only for this purpose, to derive a succession of Ministers, and doctrine from the Apostles. He that would receive a larger answer to this objection, let him read Gersomus Bucerus, de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ, p. 518, to 524. 436, to 498 usque 530, 438, 539 and Davidis Blondelli Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi, which will give him ample satisfaction.

t Adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 2, 3. l. 4. c. 43 44. 45.
u De Præſcriptionibus adverſ. Hæreticos.
2 Euſebius Eccleſ Hiſt. l 5. c. 12, 22. Fox Acts and Monuments p. 1465.

Obj. 7. If any finally object, that *Paul desired* Timothy *to abide still at* Ephesus, *when he went into* Macedonia, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and that the Greek verb προσμένειν signifies *a constant residence or abiding in one place.* Therefore *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus:* which if it be a solid Argument, proves many of our Court, Non-resident Prelates and Ministers, to be no Bishops (because they reside and abide not, much lesse preach and keep hospitality on their Bishopricks, and Benefices) rather than *Timothy* to be Diocæsan Bishop of *Ephesus.*

Answ. 1. To this I answer, first, that the argument is a grosse inconsequent. For *Timothy* might abide thus at *Ephesus* as an Evangelist, as an Elder, as *Pauls* assistant, or substitute only; as an ordinary Minister, not as a Bishop; his abiding therefore at *Ephesus* is insufficient to prove him a Diocæsan Bishop of that See.

Secondly, Paul *and* Titus *ordained Elders, in every Church to abide and continue with their flocks,* Act. 14. 23. Tit 1. 5, 7. yet the Opposites deny these Elders to be Diocæsan Bishops.

Thirdly, Every ordinary Minister is to reside and abide upon his Cure, Rom. 12. 7, 8. 1 Cor. 7. 20. Jer. 23. 1, 5. If this argument therefore were solid, every Minister should be a Diocæsan Bishop; and that more properly then our Non-resident Bishops, Deans, Prebends, who are seldom at their Cures

* Acts 18. 1, 18, 19.

Fourthly, Paul *left* * Aquila *and* Priscilla *his wife at* Ephesus *to abide there;* Will it therefore follow, that they were Diocæsan Bishops of the *Ephesians,* and that one of them was

Episcopus,

Episcopus, and the other * Episcopi or Presbyteri, (as Bishops and Presbyters wives were usually stiled) of this Episcopal See? If not, then the Argument is invalid.

* Synodus Tunonica 2. c. 13, 14, 20. Concil. Antisiodor c. 21. Espencæus Digressionum in Tim. l. 1. c. 17.

Answer 2. *Secondly*, I answer, *That* Timothy *was to abide at* Ephesus *only for a season, till* Pauls *return out of* Macedonia, *and no longer*, 1 Tim. 3. 14, 15. c. 4. 13, 14. *after which he went with* Paul *from* Macedonia *into* Asia *to* Troas, Acts 20 4, 5. *and from thence to* Italy, Philippi *and* Rome, *Heb.* 13. 23. *Phil.* 1. 1. c. 2. 19. *Col.* 1. 1. 2 *Tim.* 4 9, 13. he being never resident at *Ephesus*, (for ought appears in Scripture or authentique story) after *Pauls* return out of *Macedonia*. His abode therefore at *Ephesus* being but for so short a time, and he so great a Non-resident from it afterward, cannot possibly argue him to be a Diocæsan Bishop of that Church.

Answer 3. *Thirdly*, The Greek word * μενειν to abide, is oft *applied in Scripture to a short abode, for a day or two, or some little space*, as well as to a perpetual fixed residence: *Mat.* 15. 32. *Mark* 8. 2. *Luke* 9. 4. c. 19. 5. c. 24. 29. *Mark* 6. 10. *Acts* 16. 15. c. 27. 31. c. 21. 7, 8. c. 1. 13. *Gal.* 2. 18. So it is in the objected text; where it is put only in opposition to *Pauls* journey into *Macedonia*; in respect whereof *Timothy* continuing at *Ephesus* till his return, might be truly said, *to abide there*, though after his return he removed thence to other Churches; as *Gersomus Bucerus, De Gubernatione Ecclesiæ*, p. 532, to 581. observes.

* Joannis Scapulæ Lexicon Col. 1032, 1033.

Answer 4. *Fourthly*, *Paul* did not enjoyn, *but beseech Timothy to abide at Ephesus*: therefore his residence there was but arbitrary at his own pleasure, not coactive, not enjoyned by vertue of an Episcopal office, or obligation: this text therefore cannot prove *Timothy* to be Bishop of *Ephesus*, no more than his stay at *Corinth*, and other places whither *Paul* sent him, proves him to be Bishop of those Churches.

Answer 5. *Finally*, Admit *Timothy* to be both the first and sole Bishop of *Ephesus*, which is false; yet this makes nothing for, but against our Hierarchical and Diocæsan Bishops: *for Ephesus was but one City, one Parish, one Church, one Flock and Congregation*; as is evident by *Acts* 20. 17, 28, 29. c. 18. 24, 25, 29. c. 19. 1, to 18. *Ephes.* 1. 1. c. 4. 4, 16. c. 6.

Timothy no Diocæsan Bishop of Ephesus.

21, 22, 23. 1 Tim. 1. 3. c. 5. 17, to 23. Rev. 1. 20. c. 2. 1. So that the argument from this example is but this, *Timothy* was only Bishop of one City, Parish, Church, Flock and Congregation, not of many: Therefore all Bishops ought to be so too, as well as he.

Obj. If any object, That the City of *Ephesus* was a Diocess; for it had *many Elders*, therefore many Parishes, and Congregations? *Acts* 20. 17. 28. 1 Tim. 5 17.

Answ. 1. I answer, that the argument follows not; For first, in *the Apostles times, and in the primitive Church, every particular Church and Congregation had* * *many Bishops, Elders, Ministers, and Deacons in it, who did joyntly teach, and instruct it, and likewise govern and order it by their common counsel and consent*; as is evident by Acts 1. 14, to 26. c. 2. 1, to 47. c. 3. 1. c. 4. 3, 8, 9, 21, 23, [illegible] to 37. c. 5. 18, to 33, 42. c. 6. 1, to 9. c. 11. 29, 30. c. [illegible] 23. c. 15. 2, to 23, 25, 32. c. 20. 17, to 30. c. 21. 11. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 5. 4, to 14. c. 5. 17. Tit. 1. 5, 7. James 5. 14. 1 Cor. 14. 23, to 33. Hebr. 13. 17. 1 Thess. 5. 12. Gal. 1. 17. c. 2 9. *Ignatius Epist.* 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14. *Polycarpus Epist. ad Philippenses, Irenæus contra Hæres. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *l.* 4. *c.* 43, 44. *Tertull. Adversus Gentes Apol. c.* 39. *St. Cyprian Epist.* 6, 12, 28. *Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. l.* 7. *Ambrose Epist. l.* 10. *Epist.* 80. *Hieronimus, Sedulius, Chrysostomus, Primasius, Remigius, Beda, Haymo, Rabanus Maurus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Anselmus, Petrus Lombardus,* and sundry others, *in their Commentaries and Expositions upon* Phil. 1. 1. Tit. 1. 5, 7. Acts 15. and 20. 17, 28. *The fourth Council of Carthage,* Can. 22, 23, 24, 25. *The Council of Aken under Ludovicus Pius,* Can. 8, 10, 11. *The* 12 *Council of Toledo,* Can. 4. and all Writers generally accord.

* *See Gerſomus Bucerus Diſſertatio De Gubern. Eccleſ. p.* 213, 246, 282, 332, 307, 304, 307, 308, 316, 417, 461. *Davidis Blond. Apolog, Section* 3. *accordingly.*

Secondly, We at this day have many Prebends, Canons, and Ministers in every Cathedral and Collegiate Church, yea in every Colledge in our Universities, and elsewhere; yet but one Church, College, Congregation.

Thirdly, In many other Churches in the Country where the Parishes are large, and there are divers Chapels of ease, we have many Curates and Ministers; yet but one Church, one Parish, not a Diocess; neither is the chief Minister

niſter either a Biſhop or Diocæſan, though he have divers Curates and Miniſters under him, to aſſiſt him in his Miniſtery: yea in many places where there is but one Church, no ſuch Chapels of eaſe, and the Pariſhes great, we have ſeveral Miniſters, Lecturers, Curates, in ſome 4. or 5. in moſt 2. or 3. yet no Dioceſs, nor Biſhop. Neither is this a Novelty, but an antient conſtitution, not only inſtituted by the Apoſtles, and continued ever ſince, but likewiſe enjoyned by ſundry Councils and Decretals, as you may read at large in *Gratian*, cauſ. 7. queſt. 1. and in the * *Counceil of Oxford under* Stephen Langhton *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *in the year of our Lord*, 1222. which decreed, *That in all Pariſh Churches, where the Pariſh is great, there ſhould be* 2. *or* 3. *Preſbyters at the leaſt according to the greatneſs of the Pariſh, and the value of the Benefice, leſt that one only Miniſter being ſick, or otherwiſe debilitated, Eccleſiaſtical Benefits (which God forbid) ſhould be either withdrawn, or denied to the Pariſhoners that were ſick, or willing to be preſent at divine offices.* The multitude or plurallity therefore of the Elders in the Church of *Epheſus*, is no argument at all to prove, that it was a Dioceſs, or that *Timothy* was a Diocæſan Biſhop, becauſe he had Miniſters and Curates under him; for then our Deans, Archdeacons, and Pluraliſts, who have many Livings, Chappels, (and ſo many Miniſters) under them, ſhould be Diocæſan Biſhops too by this reaſon.

* *Iohannes de Aleo, Conſtit: provin fol.* 122. *Lynd provin. Conſtit. l.* 3. *Tit. De Parochiis, fol.* 134.

Secondly, I anſwer, that admit there were divers Churches and Congregations in *Epheſus*, which is very * improbable, *the greateſt part of the Citizens being Idolaters, and the City it ſelf a great Worſhipper of the Goddeſſe Diana, and of the Image which fell from Jupiter*, Acts 19. 21. to 41 yet it cannot be proved, that *Timothy* was chief Biſhop and ſuperintendent over all theſe Churches, but only of one of them: as every Miniſter and Biſhop of *England*, is a Miniſter and Biſhop of the Church of *England*, but not a Miniſter and Biſhop in and over all the Churches of *England*, but in and over his own Pariſh-Church, and Dioceſs only. For *Paul* himſelf (who planted that Church, † *reſided in it for three years ſpace*, during which time there was no Diocæſan

* *See Eph.* 4. 4.

† *Acts* 19. 10. c. 20. 31.

ſan Biſhop of it but himſelf) expreſly calls the *Elders of the Church of Epheſus*, BISHOPS *and Overſeers of that Church, and that by the Holy Ghoſts own inſtitution*; and thereupon exhorts them, *to take heed to all the Flock, and to feed and rule that Church of God, which he had purchaſed with his own blood*, Acts 20. 28. 1 Tim. 5. 17.

Since therefore every one of theſe Elders, by the Holy Ghoſts inſtitution, and *Pauls* reſolution was no other, but a *Biſhop* over his own Flock, (if ſeveral) both to inſtruct and rule it; it is certain that *Timothy* (if he were a Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and there were many Churches in it) was only Biſhop of one of them, not of all; and ſo no Diocæſan Biſhop, as our Prelates and their Flatt[illegible] vainly pretend. *Timothy* therefore * being neither a [illegible]or firſt, ſole, or any Biſhop of *Epheſus*, or of any [illegible]ace, or if a Biſhop, no Diocæſan Biſhop, but of one Church and Congregation only, as theſe premiſes evidence; all our Prelates inferences drawn from his example to prove their Epiſcopal Authority and Juriſdiction *Jure Divino* (which for the moſt part hang upon his Epiſcopal Rochet only) fall quite to ground, and their pretended *divine* Epiſcopal Authority together with it.

* *See Smectymnuus Anſwer to Biſhop Halls Remonſtrance p. 48, to 54. printed 1640.*

QUESTION II.

I Now proceed to the next Queſtion, *Whether Titus were Biſhop, or Archbiſhop of Crete?* Wherein I ſhall likewiſe diſcuſſe theſe two Queſtions more, *Whether the power of ordination belongs only to Biſhops, not to Presbyters? And whether this Paradox of the Prelates be true, that Ordainers are greater in Juriſdiction and Degree, than thoſe that are Ordained?*

What ever the common bruit and error of theſe or former times conceive, under correction, I perſwade my ſelfe that *Titus* was no Biſhop nor Archbiſhop of *Crete*, and that for theſe enſuing invincible reaſons.

Firſt, Becauſe the Scripture never terms him a Biſhop; nor St. *Paul*, who often ſtiles him, *his Partner and Fellow-helper concerning the Corinthians*, (not Cretians;) *the Meſſenger*

senger of the Churches, (not Bishop) *and the glory of Christ*, 2 Cor. 8. 2, 3, 6, 16 his *Son*, Tit. 1. 6. his *Brother*, 2 Cor. 7. 6, 13, 14. never a Bishop, as some would make him.

Secondly, Because his *chief imployment was to the Church of Corinth, after that he had been left by Paul at Crete, as Pauls partner and fellow-helper in that Church*, 2 Cor. 2, 13. c. 7. 6, 13. c. 8. 6, 16, 23. c. 12. 18.

Thirdly, Because he *was Pauls companion, attendant, partner, fellow helper, Messenger, fixed to no settled place of residence*, as Bishops were, 2 Cor. 2, 13. c. 7, 6, 13. c. 8. 6, 16, 13. c. 12. 18. Gal. 2. 1, 3. 2 Tim. 4. 10. *sent by him from Rome, long after his being in Crete, into Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. 4. 10.

Fourthly, Because *Paul* writs expresly to him, *Tit.* 1. 5. not that he ordained him Arch-bishop or Bishop of *Crete*, but *that he left him in Crete* (for a season) *for this cause, that he should set in order, the things that were wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as he had appointed him*: Therefore was he left there only as *Pauls* Vicar general, Commissary or Substitute, to order those things, which *Paul* could not dispatch, *in such sort, as he had appointed him*, whiles he was there residing, not as the Archbishop or Lord Bishop of *Crete*, to order all things there, by his own Episcopal Jurisdiction and authority alone as he listed himself.

Fifthly, He expresly charged him, *to come to him diligently to Nicopolis when he should send Artemas or Tichycus to him, for there he intended to winter*, Tit. 3. 12. by which it is evident, that his stay in *Crete* by *Pauls* appointment, was very short, not above half a year, if so much; after which we never read he returned thither, though we find, *he was sent to Corinth, and Dalmatia, that he went up to Hierusalem with Paul, and came to him during his imprisonment at Rome*, Gal. 2. 1, 3. 2 Cor. 2. 13. c. 7. 13, 14. c. 8. 6, 16, 23. c. 12. 8. 2 Tim. 4. 10. His short abode therefore in *Crete*, without returning thither, proves him to be no Bishop in, or of it.

Sixthly, *Paul* chargeth him, to bring *Zenas the Lawyer, and Apollos diligently on their way, that nothing might be wanting to them*, Tit. 3. 13. Now it is very unlikely, that an Arch-bishop or Bishop of *Crete*, *wherein were* * 90. *walled Cities*, would

* *Homer. Odyss.* 19.

would stoop so low, as to wait thus upon a Lawyer, as *Zenas* was, or a Disciple, as *Apollos* was, unless he were far more Humble than any Archbishops or Prelates in these our times; who are commonly so insolently proud, as to disdain all familiar conversation with Lawyers, or Ministers.

Seventhly, *Paul* left *Titus* Bishop of no one City in *Crete*, and he expressly enjoyns him, *to ordain* (not one but many) *Elders* (in the plural number) *in every City of Crete*, Tit. 1. 5, 7. where there were no less than 50. *walled Cities in Homer's time*; which Elders were no other but *Bishops*, and so termed by him v. 7, (*For a Bishop must be blameless, &c.*) as *Hierom*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, *Theodoret*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Remigius*, *Beda*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Bruno*, *Theophilact*, *Oecumenius*, *Anselm*, *Lyra*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, *Aquinas*, with most modern Commentators on this text abroad. If then *Paul* gives expresse directions to *Titus*, *to ordain many Elders and Bishops in every City of Crete*, constituting him a Bishop in none of them, that we read of, (an apparent argument, that he was no Bishop there, because he had there no Bishops See at all, and was no sole Bishop of any one City:) it is not probable that he constituted him sole Archbishop, or Bishop of all *Crete*, (*which had* * *anciently no lesse than 4 Archbishops, and 21. Bishops in it*) *it being the Apostles practice to place many Bishops and Elders in one Church, but never one Bishop or Archbishop over many Churches*, Phil. 1. 2. Act. 20. 28. Hence * *Athanasius*, *Chrysostom*, *Oecumenius* and *Theophilact*, on *Titus* 1. 5, 7. write thus, *Here he will have Bishops to be understood for Presbyters or Ministers, as we have elsewhere often said, neither verily would he have the charge of the whole Island to be permitted, or granted to one man, but that every one should have his one proper cure and charge allotted him: for he knew that the labour and pains would be the lighter, and that the people would be governed with greater diligence, if that the Doctor or Teacher should not be distracted with the Government of many Churches, but should only give himself to the Government of one, and study to compose and adorn it with his manners.* So also *Peter Lombard*, * *Alphonsus de Castro*, * *Doctor Barnes*, and others on and from this text, determine.

* *Mercators Atlas in English London.* 1635. p. 812.

* *Quoted by Dr. Barnes in his Works, p.* 210. *See Gersomus Bucerus de Gubern. Eccles. p.* 520, 521.

* *Adversus Hæreses. Tit. Episcopus.*

* *P.* 210.

Eighthly,

Eighthly, All generally * accord, that *Archbishops, yea Metropolitanes, and Diocæsan* BISHOPS *themselves are not of Divine or Apostolical, but Papal and Humane Constitution*; witnesse Pope *Nicholas apud Gratianum Distinct. 22. c. 1. Omnes sive Patriarchæ cujuslibet apicem, sive Metropoleon primatus, aut Episcopatuum Cathedras, vel Ecclesiarum sive cujuscunque ordinis dignitatem,* **instituit Romana Ecclesia.** Which Pope † *Anacletus in his 3. Epist. c. 3.* doth likewise aver, and Pope *Lucinus, and Clement, in Gratian, Distinct. 80.* affirm as much; informing us, *that Archbishops and Primates are the Successors of the Heathenish Arch-Flamens, and to be placed only in those Cities where the Arch-Flamens had their Sees:* with which *Peter Lombard* accords, *lib. 4. Distinct. 24.* Hence our ‖ *Historians record of King Lucius,* the first Christian Prince of this our Realm, *that he instituted three Archbishopricks, and twenty five Bishopricks and Bishops, instead of the three Arch-Flamens, and twenty five Flamens, changing their Sees into Bishopricks and Archbishopricks*; by which it is evident, that Archbishops, Patriarkes and Metropolitanes (*instituted only at first by* * *several Councils and Princes*) are no Divine or Apostolical, but only a Humane institution; This *all the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy of England, in their Institution of a Christian man,* dedicated to King *Henry* the 8. fol. 59, 60. resolve in these termes. **It is out of all doubt,** *that there is no mention made neither in Scripture, neither in the writings of any authentical Doctor or Author of the Church, being within the time of the Apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the preeminence of power, order or jurisdiction between the Apostles themselves, or between the Bishops themselves, but that they* **were all equal in power, authority and jurisdiction:** *And that there is now and since the time of the Apostles, any such diversity or difference among the Bishops,* **it was devised by the antient Fathers** *of the Primitive Church, for the conservation of good order, and unity of the Catholick Church; and that, either by the consent and authority, or else at least* **by the permission and sufferance of the Princes and civil powers,** *for the time ruling. For the said Fathers, considering the great and infinite multitude of Christian men so largely increased through the world,*

* *See Gersomus Bucerus p. 233, 261, 398, usque 402, 550. Tho. Cartwright 2d. Reply to Whitgift, p. 404, to 616.*

† *See Anacleti Epist. 3. c. 3. Surius Concil. Tom. 1. p. 165.*

‖ *Galfridus Monumetensis, Hist. l. 5. c. 19. Ponticus Verunnius, Brit. Hist l. 4. p. 100. Polichron. l. 4. c. 16. f. 163. Antiq. Eccles. Brit. p. 7. Jer. Usserius de Brit. Eccles. Primordiis c. 5, 6. with sundry others.*

* *Surius Concil. Tom. 1. p. 140. 163, 195, 342, 305, 392. Tom. 2. p. 1046. Tom. 3 p. 547. Socrat. Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 8 Evagrius Eccles. Hist. l. 2. c. 18.*

and taking examples of the old Testament, thought it expedient to make an order of Degrees among Bishops and spiritual governers of the Church, and so ordained some to be Patriarkes, some to be Metropolitanes, some to be Archbishops, some to be Biskops; and to them did limit severally (not only) their certain Dioceſſe and Provinces, wherein they should exercise their power, and not exceed the same, but also certain bounds and limits, of their jurisdiction and power, &c. The same is averred by Learned Bishop *Hooper*, in his *Exposition upon the* 23. *Psalm, fol.* 40. who writes, *That Archbishops were first ordained in Constantines time:* yea * *Archbishop Whitgift* himself confesseth as much, *That Archbishops are neither of Divine, nor Apostolical, but Humane Institution, since the Apostles times.* And † *Patrick Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrews in Scotland, in his publick Recantation, in the Synod of Perſſe in Scotland, Anno* 1591. Professed sincerely, (*ex animo*) *That Bishops and Ministers by Gods words, were all equal and the very same; That the Hierarchy and Superiority of Bishops over other Ministers,* **nullo nititur verbi Dei fundamento**, *had no foundation at all in the word of God, but was a meer Humane Institution long after the Apostles times, from whence the Antichristian Papacie of the Bishop of Rome hath both its rise and progresse; and that for* 500. *years last past, it hath been the chiefest instrument of persecuting and suppressing the truth and Saints of God in all Countries and Kingdoms, as all Historians manifest.* Thus this Archbishop in his *Palinody*, disclaiming not only Archbishops, *but even Diocæsan Bishops to be of Divine, and only of Humane Institution,* long after the Apostles, giving over his Archbishoprick thereupon, and living a poor dejected life. This being then granted on all hands not only by Protestant Prelates and Divines, but likewise by Popish Canonists and Schoole men, as || *George Cassander*, a Learned moderate Popish writer, affirms in these positive words; *An Episcopatus inter ordines ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit. Convenit autem* **inter omnes** *olim Apostolicorum* **ætate inter Episcopos et Presbyteros discrimen nullum fuisse.** *Constat autem sacros ordines propriè dici Diaconatum & Presbyteratum, & quos solos primativam Ecclesiam in usu habuisse legatur.* It is clear, that

* *In his Reply to Tho. Cartwright. See Cartwright his second Reply against Whitgift. Tract.* 8. *fol.* 414, *to* 616.

† *An. Melvini Petri Adamsoni Palinodia, printed An.* 1620.

|| *Georgii Cassandri Consultatio. Artic.* 14.

Titus

Titus could not be Bishop of all *Crete*; for then he should be an Archbishop, having divers Bishops under him, those Elders which he placed in every City of *Crete*, being no other but Bishops, Tit. 1. 7. as all acknowledge; and Archbishops were not instituted till after the Apostles and *Titus* dayes; For these Reasons I conceive, that *Titus* was not Bishop of *Crete*, having no Episcopal or Archiepiscopal See there appointed to him; which Learned * *Gersomus Bucerus* hath more at large manifested, to such who will take pains to peruse him.

* *De Gubern. Eccles.* p. 233. to 238. 299. to 390. 394. 395. 396. 397. 490. to 493. 580. 581.

Object. 1. If any object 1. that the *Postscript of the Epistle to Titus*, stiles him, *Titus ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*: Ergo he was Bishop or Archbishop of *Crete*.

Answer 1. I answer first, that *this and all other Postscripts are* ‖ *no part of the Scripture, or Epistles, as* Beza and others attest, and * Mr. *Perkins* prove at large, but an *addition of some private person since*, as is evident by the words themselves in the preterimperfect tense, and third person, **It was written to Titus, &c.** therefore no convincing Authority. 2ly. That this clause (*ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*) is no part of the Postscript, but a late Appendix to it, not found in any of the Copies of this Epistle which the Fathers follow in their Commentaries, in few or no antient Greek, Latine or English Copies and Translations of this Epistle, in few or no Translations of late Commentators. 3ly. Had *Titus* been Bishop of *Crete*, it is like *Paul* would have given him this Title in the Epistle, (where he stiles him, *Titus his own Son after the common Faith* c. 1. v. 4.) as well as in the Postscript; which in truth is none of his, but some others. 4ly. * *Ludovicus Capellus*, * *Baronius*, and others observe, that the Epistle to *Titus*, and first Epistle to *Timothy*, were both written before *Pauls* first going to *Rome*, and before *Titus* or *Timothy* were Bishops, as Bishop *Hall* in his *Vindication*, p. 97. and *Smectymnuus*, in his answer thereunto, p. 115, 116, 127, 128. confess. Therefore all the Arguments drawn from these Epistles and Postscripts, to prove them Bishops before they were such, and the sole power of ordination to be in Bishops, as Bishops, must be

‖ *David Dickson his short explanation on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 133, 333.

* *Mr. Perkins his Commentary on Gal.* 6. p. 496, 497, 498, 499.

* *Chronolog. Tab.*
* *Annal. Tom.* 1.

most ridiculous and absurd. 5ly. This Postscript stiles *Titus*, *Ordained the first Bishop* of the Church of the *Cretians*: Therefore, if true, it must needs be added long after this Epistle written; because he could not be stiled the FIRST BISHOP, till he had one or more Successors in his See; in relation to whom he is, and only properly could be stiled, *First Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*. 6ly. It is observable, That the Postscript stiles him only, *First Bishop of the Church* (in the singular, not Churches in the plural number) *of the Cretians*. Therefore Bishop only over one Church, in *Crete*, not over all the Churches and Cities in it; who had many Elders, the same with Bishops, and so stiled in the beginning of the Epistle by *Paul* himself, Tit. 1,5, 7. as all * antient and moderu Expositors attest. 7ly. That these Postscripts to *Pauls* Epistles were first added to them by *Theodoret*, and that not to the Text, but to his Commentary on these Epistles 430 years after Christ; there being no Postscripts to St. *Peters*, *Johns*, or *Judes* Epistles, on which he did not comment; nor in the works of any Father before or after him, till *Oecumenius*, Anno 1050. nor in any Greek or Latin Copies of these Epistles in that Age. 8ly. That these Postscripts both in *Theodoret* and *Oecumenius* are placed not immediately after the Original Text it self, as now they are in some of our late *English Bibles*, new Testaments, and some modern Commentators, but only after the end of their Commentaries, as a part of them and no part or appurtenance of the Text it self. 9ly. That these clauses (ordained the first Bishop of the *Ephesians*, and ordained the first Bishop of the *Cretians*) whereon our Prelates found the Episcopacy of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and their own Hierarchy too, are not extant in *Theodorets* Postscripts to the Epistle to *Timothy* and *Titus*, which run only thus, *The second to Timothy was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the Roman Emperor the second time. The Epistle to Titus was written from Nicopolis*: his Postscripts therefore will no wayes ayd, but confound their cause, since I may well argue, neither *Paul* in his Epistles, nor *Theodoret* in his Postscripts term *Timothy* or *Titus* Bishops of *Ephesus* or *Crete*, therefore

* *Hierom, Ambrose, Primasius, Remigius, Sedulius, Haymo, Augustin, Beda, Theophil. Oecumenius, and others with them.*

Secunda ad Timotheum scripta est Romæ, quando ad Neronem adductus est Romanorum Cæsarem. Epistola ad Titum Cretensis Ecclesiæ scripta est Nicopoli oppido Macedoniæ.

fore they were no Bishops of these places, unless better proofs than these Epistles and Postscripts be produced to evidence it. The rare antient Manuscript Parchment Copy of the *Greek Bible*, sent to his Majesty by *Cyrillus* late *Patriarch of Constantinople*, remaining in his Majesties Librarie at St. *James*, supposed by some to be as antient as *Tecla*: but undoubtedly one of the antientest Copies this day extant; hath no other Postscript to the first Epistle to *Timothy*, but this, Πρὸς τιμόθεον Α ἐγράφη ἀπὸ λαοδικείας: No other to the second to *Timothy*, but this, Πρὸς τιμόθεον Β. ἐγράφη ἀπὸ λαοδικείας: not from *Rome*: And no other Postscript to *Titus*, but Πρὸς Τίτον ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως (all writen in Capitals) with which the *Syriac* Copies accord. So that all the residue is but a late spurious addition. The first Author I find these additional clauses (ordained the first Bishop of the *Ephesians*, and ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the *Cretians*) extant in, is *Oecumenius*, who flourished not till the year 1050. being a patcher together only of other mens Commentaries, and none of the Orthodoxest or most Judicious Writers. And withall, this is observable,

1. That *Oecumenius* placeth these Postscripts after his Commentaries, as a part of them, not immediately after the Text as a part or appendant thereof.

2ly. That he first cites his own additions to these Postscripts after his Commentaries in one distinct line, and then placeth *Theodorets* Postscript in another different line, some good distance under it, in this manner,

Πρὸς Τιμόθεον δευτέρα ἡ ἐξήσων Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα.

Ἐγράφη ἀπὸ ῥώμης, ὅτε ἐκ δευτέρου πρίσεται παῦλος τῷ καίσαρι Νέρωνι.

Πρὸς Τίτον ἡ κρητῶν Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα.

Ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς μακεδονίας.

3ly. From *Oecumenius* till about 450. years after him, these Additional clauses are not extant in any Commentators or Translations of the Epistles into any other Language, and but in very few Greek copies, and those taken out of *Oecumenius*.

nius. Therefore doubtleſſe he was the firſt Author of them. And ſo they are of no great Antiquity or credit.

Now that you may more clearly diſcern what a ſandy foundation theſe Poſtſcripts are to build the weighty Hierarchy of our Lordly Prelates on, give me leave to inform you of ſome obſervable particulars touching theſe Poſtſcripts upon mine own ſearch and obſervation, which no others have hitherto obſerved.

1. That *Athanaſius*, *Ambroſe*, *Jerome*, *Sedulius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Primaſius*, *Remigius*, *Beda* *Rabanus* *Maurus*, *Haymo*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, *Bruno*, *Aquinas*, *Nicholaus de Lyra*, *Gherran*, *Dionyſius Carthuſianus*, *John Salesbury*, *Anſelm*, and *Peter Lombard*, the antienteſt Commentators on the Epiſtles of *Paul*, have no Poſtſcripts at all extant in them, neither after the Text, nor after their Commentaries; no nor yet *Eraſmus*, *Melanction*, *Zuinglius*, *Zanchius*, *Alfonſus Salmeron*, *Benedictus Juſtinianus*, *Ambroſius Caterinus*, *Cornelius a Lapide*, *Claudius Eſpencæus*, *Antonius Scanus*, *Adam Sasbout*, *Eſtius*, *Hemingius*, *Joannis Arboreus*, *Soto Major*, nor any other Commentator almoſt, whether Proteſtant or Papiſt.

2ly. That in ſundry antient *Engliſh and Latin Manuſcript New Teſtaments* and *Bibles* which I have ſeen; in the printed *New Teſtament*, ſet forth in *Greek and Latin* by *Franciſcus Xemenez*, *in Academia Complutenſi*; in the Bible of *Iſidor Clarius Venetiis*, 1557. in all the *Latin vulgar Bibles*, attributed to *Saint Jerom*; In the *New Teſtament*, ſet forth by *Eraſmus*; in the *Latin Bible* printed at *Rome* by command of Pope *Sixtus* the fifth, *Anno* 1592. in the New Teſtament, compriſing the Latin vulgar Tranſlation, that of *Guido Fabricius* out of the *Syriack*, that of *Arrias Montanus*, and *Eraſmus*, ſet forth altogether by *Laurentius Bierlinke Antwerpiæ*, 1616. in the New Teſtament, ſet forth by *Miles Coverdale* in Latin and Engliſh, *Anno* 1536. in Mr. *Tyndals* Engliſh Bible, and in the Engliſh Tranſlation which Doctor *Fulk* follows in his Anſwer to the Rhemiſh Teſtament, and in many antient Greek and Latin Copies, there is no Poſtſcript at all to be found.

3 ly. That in the Latin Bible, ſet forth and printed by *Robert Stephen*, *Pariſiis*, 1532. And in the Latin Bible of *Joannis*

annis Benedictus, Parisiis, 1558. the Postscripts are thrust out of the Page, and put into the Margin, as not worthy to stand under the Text, and as being of small or no account.

4ly. That in the Latin Bible set forth by *Robert Stephen*, Parisiis 1532. in the Latine and Greek Bibles of *Philip Melactions* Edition, *Tiguri*, 1543. and *Basiliæ*, 1545. in *Sebastian Castalio* his Edition of the Bible, *Basiliæ*, 1551. in the translations of the New Testament out of the *Syriack*, both by *Guido Fabritius*, and *Emanuel Tremelius*; in the Dutch Bible, set forth by *David Walderus*, *Hamburgæ*, 1596. in the French Bible, set out by the *Doctors of Lovain* a Paris, 1616. in the Latin Bible of *Joannis Benedictus*, Parisiis 1558. in the Bible translated into English by *Thomas Mathew*, Anno 1537. in the English Bible set forth by *diverse excellent Learned men*, Printed *Cum Privilegio*, by *Thomas Petit*, and *Robert Redman*, London 1540. in the *English Bible appointed to be read in Churches*, printed at *London*, 1568. in the Great Bible lately published by Doctor *Walton*, London, 1657. in the Syriack and Æthiopick versions. And in sundry other Bibles and New Testaments which I have seen, these clauses (*ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians*, and *ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*) are not at all to be found in the Postscripts to the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*; And indeed you shall seldom find them in any but Master *Beza*, and those that follow his Edition, (as Master *Calvin* and some few others do in their Commentaries) whereas both he and they are no Friends, but rather Enemies to Episcopacy, and disclaim these Postscripts as false and spurious.

5ly. Master *Beza*, and the Setters forth of the Greek Bible printed by the Heirs of *Andrew*, *Francofurti*, 1597. passe this sentence upon these Postscripts: and this clause, ordained *the first Bishop of Ephesus*, or, *of the Church of the Ephesians*. *Non extat in quibusdam vetustis codicibus, & sane suppositum fuisse puto.* And *Beza* further addes, that these Postscripts were added by some *vel indoctis, vel non satis attentis*. *Guilelmus Estius*, a famous Roman Doctor, in his Commentary on 2 *Tim.* 1. 4. writes thus of the Postscript to it. *Græca subscriptio post finem Epistolæ sic habet; Scripta è Roma ad Timotheum secunda, cum Paulus iterum sisteretur Cæsari Neroni*, (where he

he omits this addition, *Ephesiorum Ecclesiæ primus Episcopus*) and then passeth this verdict upon it, *Sed hujusmodi Græce subscriptiones, ut incerti sunt autoris* ITA NON *Magnæ autoritatis.* And *Thomas de Vio Gajetanus, Serrarius, Andreas Hyperius, Estius*, with others, refute the subscription to *Titus*, *That this Epistle was writen from Nicopolis of Macedonia*; and the *Century Writers with others deny, that the *Second to Timothy was writen from Rome at Pauls second appearing before Nero*, censuring it upon very good grounds for a falshood and mistake: All which considered, I wonder our great learned Prelates, Bishop *Downham*, Bishop *White*, Bishop *Hall*, and especially our great Antiquary * Bishop *Usher*, should so much insist upon these *spurious false Postscripts*, and draw a main Argument from them, to prove their Episcopacy of divine institution, when as *Bellarmine* and those Papists, who write most eagerly for the Prelates Hierarchy, are ashamed to produce such a false and impotent proof for their groundlesse Episcopal jurisdiction.

* Cent. Mag. 2. col. 597.

* The judgement of Dr. Reynolds, touching the Original of Episcopacy, more largely confirmed out of antiquity by James Archbishop of Armagh, p. 5.

Secondly, I answer, that this Postscript to *Titus* is directly false; for it saith, *That this Epistle was written from Nicopolis of Macedonia.* Now it is clear by the 12. *verse of the third Chapter of this very Epistle*, that *Paul* was not at *Nicopolis*, when he writ it, but at some other place; for he writes thus to *Titus*, *when I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tichicus, be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis, for* THERE (not HERE) *have I intended to winter.* Now had *Paul* then been at *Nicopolis*, he would have written thus, for *here* (not *there*) *I have intended to winter*; *there* being ever spoken of a place which we are absent from, *here* only of a place present. This Postscript therefore being false, as ‖ Mr. *Perkins* and others hence conclude, it can be no part of Canonical Scripture, or of this Epistle, none of *Pauls* penning, but a mere Appendix of some ignorant Scribe or Commentator in After-times, and so no solid proof to manifest *Titus* Bishop or Archbishop of *Crete*, nor yet of *Nicopolis*, when this Epistle was written.

‖ Commentary on Gal. 6. Vol. 2. p. 459.

Obj. 2. If they secondly object, *that Paul left Titus in Crete to set in order the things that were wanting*, Tit. 1. 5. *Ergo* he was a Bishop.

Answ. I answer, that this is a mere inconsequent; and I may

may argue in like nature; Our Archbishops and Bishops (especially those who turn Courtiers, Counsellers of State, and Nonresidents,) leave (a) their Archdeacons, Chancellors, Commissaries, Vicars generals, and Officials, to visit, order, correct their Diocess, and to set in order those Ceremonies, Altars, Images, and Church-ornaments, which were well wanting (now too much abounding) in them; *Ergo* Archdeacons, Chancellers, Vicars generals, and Officials, are Archbishops, and Bishops of those Diocesses: The King sends his Judges, Commissioners and under Officers to some Counties or Cites, to set Causes, Counties, People, Armies, Forts, Cities in good order, and to see defects in these supplyed. *Ergo* Judges, Commissioners and Officers are Kings: *Churchwardens ought by the Canons of* 1571, *and* 1603. *to set in order and provide such books, ornaments, and other necessaries as are wanting in Parish Churches, and see them well repaired*: Ergo Churchwardens are Bishops: For *Titus* was here left, *to set in order the things that were wanting*, AS PAUL HAD APPOINTED HIM, and no otherwise, *Tit.* 1. 5,6,7,8,9. he did all by his direction and authority, not his own. There is nothing therefore in this, *of ordering things that were wanting in the Church of Crete*, which savours, of Episcopal Jurisdiction. And I may better argue hence, *Titus* did nothing at all in *Crete* but by *Pauls* special appointment and Commission; *Ergo* he was no Bishop; or if a Bishop: *Ergo Bishops should order nothing in their Bishopricks, nor keep any visitations, but by special direction and Commission from the Apostles*, [b] *King, or State, authorizing them*; Then the Objectors conclude; *Ergo* he was a Bishop; and Bishops, Arch-Bishops, (yea Archdeacons too without any special commission from the Apostles, King and State) may make and institute what orders, constitutions, articles, and ceremonies they please, as now they do in their illegal Courts and Visitations, kept in their own names, without any Patent from the King.

Obj. 3. If any object in the third place, That *Titus was left to ordain Elders in every City in Crete*; Tit. 1. 5. *Ergo* he was a Bishop: because none have power to ordain Elders, but

[a] *Bishop Latimers fourth Sermon of the Plough. Fox Acts and Monuments, p.* 119. &c.

[b] *So the Statutes of* 25. *H.* 8. *c.* 29. 37. *H.* 8. *c.* 17. 27. *H.* 8. *c.* 15. 1 *E.* 6. *c.* 2. 1. *Eliz. c.* 1, 2. 8. *Eliz. c.* 1. 25. *H.* 8. *c.* 21. 31. *H.* 8. *c.* 9. 14. 32. *H.* 8. *c.* 15, 16, 2 *H.* 5 *c.* 1. 14. *Eliz. c.* 5.

but Bishops; since none ordained Elders in *Crete* but *Titus*, who was a Bishop.

That the power of ordination of Ministers belongs not only to Bishops.

Answ. 3. I answer first, that this is as bad a consequence as the former, and a mere circular argumentation: For first they will needs prove *Titus* a Bishop, because he ordained Elders; and none but Bishops can ordain *Elders*; and then next they prove, that none but Bishops can ordain Elders, because *Titus* (forsooth) was a Bishop, and he only did ordain Elders in *Crete*. A mere circle, and *Petitio Principii*: yet this is the Logick of our great Rabbi Prelates.

Secondly, I answer, that this Proposition whereon they ground themselves and their Prelacy, *that none have any right Jure divino, to ordain Elders or Ministers, but Bishops*; and that *quatenus Bishops too*, which they must add, or else their argument is unsound,) is a notorious falshood, and mere sandy foundation; For first, not to remember how *Moses* a civil Magistrate, *ordained and consecrated Aaron and his Sons by Gods own appointment*, Levit. 8. 5, to 32. Exodus 29. 9, 35. *Ergo*, they ought to do so now.

First, *The Apostles themselves were ordained Apostles and consecrated Ministers by Christ himself*, Matth. 28. 19. 20. Mark. 16. 15, 16. John 20. 22, 23, 24. Acts 1. 4, 5. Rom. 1. 5. 2 Cor. 3. 6. *To whom the power of ordination originally and principally appertains*, Ephes. 4. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 12, 28. Acts 20. 28. 1 Pet. 1. 4.

Secondly, the Apostles and Evangelists ordained Elders in every Church, Acts 14. 23. c. 19. 1, 6, 7. c. 7. 6. yet they were *properly no Bishops* (or Diocæsan Bishops) as all (e) learned men, and our Antagonists themselves acknowledge.

e Fox Acts and Monuments, p. 1461.

Thirdly, The Disciples (inferiour to the Apostles and Evangelists as the Objectors teach though others deny it) *ordained Ministers and Elders too, though they were no such Bishops as the Objectors mean*, Acts 14. 1, 2, 3. c. 9, 10, 20, 23.

Acts 13. 1, 3.

Fourthly, (f) *Presbyters and ordinary Ministers ordained Elders and Ministers, yea Timothy himself was made a Minister by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. 4. 14. Thus did they in the Primitive Church; this do they in our own Church, as the *book of Ordination it self* confirms.

eth by two acts of Parliament, the 35. canon, and experience witness; this do they in the reformed Churches now, which should have no lawful Ministers, and so no true Churches, if the power of Ordination were *Jure divino* appropriated onely to Bishops, and not common with them unto other Ministers. 5. & 6. E. 6. c. 1. & 8. Eliz. c. 1.

Fifthly, Popes, Patriarks, Metropolitans, Archbishops and Chorel Bishops (neither of which are properly Bishops in the objectors sence) usually ordain Ministers: if then all these have ordained Elders, Ministers, though no Bishops, by sufficient divine Authority, (as the Objectors cannot deny of the four first, and dare not contradict it in the last,) then it is most false, that the power of ordination *Jure Divino* belongs only to Bishops, as Bishops, in the Objectors sence; for then none of those five being not properly such Bishops, or *Jure divino* could lawfully have ordained Ministers or Presbyters, as they did and do.

Thirdly, There is no one syllable in the Scripture to prove, that the power of ordination belongs only to Bishops *quatenus* Bishops; neither is there any one example to warrant it. We read of Apostles, Evangelists, Disciples, Presbyters, that laid hands on others to ordain them Elders or Ministers; but of Bishops, (I mean distinct from Presbyters and conferring orders as Bishops onely) we read not a word, how then can this be true, that the power of ordination belongs onely to Bishops *quatenus* Bishops, *Jure divino*?

Fourthly, We read not a word in Scripture of any Bishops distinct from, or superior in order, degree, dignity to Presbyters; if therefore such Bishops themselves be not *Jure divino*, the power of ordination cannot possibly belong to them *Jure divino*; the rather because we read of no man whom the Scripture expressly calls a Bishop, ordaining Ministers, in and under the Gospel.

Fifthly, Admit there were such Bishops *Jure divino*; yet that the power of ordination belongs to them *Jure divino quatenus* such Bishops, is most false, but only *quatenus* they are Presbyters: For it appertained to the Apostles, to Evangelists, to Disciples and Presbyters *Jure Divino*, though

no such Bishops as ours; and the objectors will, must and do acknowledg, that it belongs to Popes, Patriarks, Metropolitans and Archbishops, though they neither were nor are properly such Bishops, and are no divine, but meer humane institutions; therefore it must appertain unto them only, as they are Presbyters, (in which respect they all accord, and are not differenced one from another;) not *quatenus* Bishops; for then the Apostles, Evangelists, Disciples, Presbyters, Popes, Patriarks, Metropolitans, and Archbishops, being not properly such Bishops, could not lawfully ordain. The power therefore of ordination belonging to the Apostles, Evangelists, Disciples, Presbyters and others as well as to Bishops, not to Bishops only, or to them as Bishops, but as Presbyrs, (it being a [a] *meer Ministerial act, inferiour to* [b] *preaching, administring the Sacrament and baptizing, as all acknowledge*) it can be no good evidence to prove *Titus* a Bishop.

a Gersomus Bucerus p. 37. 158. to 162. 162, 499, 500, 517. 518. 540. 622, 623. 318. to 367.

b Mat. 28. 19. 20. Mar. 16. 15

Now because this power of ordination which our Prelates would Monopolize unto themselves, is the main pillar and foundation whereon they now suspend and build their Episcopal Jurisdiction over other Ministers, I shall produce some humane authorities, to prove the right, power of ordination and imposition of hands to be by Gods Law common to Presbyters as well as to Bishops; I shall begin with Councils. The 4th. c *Council of Carthage*, *Can.* 13. about the year of our Lord 418. prescribes this form of ordination of Ministers. *When a Minister is ordained, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters or Ministers likewise that are present, shall lay their hands upon his head by the Bishops hand.* This Canon is incorporated by d *Gratian into the body of the Canon Law*, and hath been practised and put in ure in all ages since, till now. The *very Glosse on* e *Gratian*, yea f *the Rhemists* and g *Roman Pontifical too*, *assuring us*, *that when a Priest is ordained, all the Priests standing by, do lay their hands upon him; neither is there any other form of ordaining Ministers, prescribed in the Canon Law, or Councils, but this alone*, which all Churches having Bishops, have observed, and yet retain. Since therefore no Bishop may or ought of himself to ordain Ministers, without the assent and

c Surius Concil. Tom. 1. p. 513.

d Distinct. 13.

e Distinct. 23.

f Notes on the 1 Tim. 4. 15.

g Pontificale Romanum p. 42.

and concurrence of the Clergy, people and others there present, as h *Gratian*, i *Illyricus*, *and* k *Gersome Bucerus*, *prove at large*; and since *all Ministers present ought to joyn with the Bishop in the imposition of hands, in all ordinations of Ministers, and have ever usually done it joyntly in all ages and Churches*; how this prerogative of ordination should be peculiar to Bishops (who may not do it without the Ministers concurrence, no more then Ministers without theirs) or advance them in degree above Presbyters by divine or canonical right, I cannot yet conjecture. True it is, that the l *Council of Ancyra*, (which I take to be spurious) about the year of our Lord 308. Can. 3. ordained; *That Choral Bishops should not ordain Presbyters or Deacons; nor yet Presbyters of the City in another Parish; but when and where the Bishop should permit them by his Letters*; And the m *Council of Antioch under Pope Julius*, Can. 10. decreed; *that Choral Bishops should not ordain Ministers and Deacons without the Bishops privity*. From whence I observe.

h *Distinct.* 23, 24, 25.

i *Appendix ad Catal. Testium Veritatis.*

k *Dissertat. de Gubernat. Eccl.* p. 318. to 367. 464, 465, 493, 498, 499, 524. See Canon. 35.

l *Surius Tom.* 1. p. 296.

m *Surius Ibid.* p. 403, 404.

First, That before these spurious Councils restrained the power of Choral Bishops and Presbyters, they did and might lawfully ordain Ministers, and Deacons without the Bishops privity or assent.

Secondly, That by his assent and licence both the one and the other, without the Bishops presence, might lawfully ordain Ministers and Deacons. These Councils therefore plainly resolve, that there is an inhærent right and power of ordination in Presbyters and *n* Choral Bishops, as they are Ministers, and that with the Bishops consent, and license they may lawfully execute it, and confer Orders: Therefore the right and power of ordination is not invested onely in Bishops, as they are Bishops, for then none else could ordain but they alone. The * forged *Constitutions of the Apostles*, fathered on *Pope* o *Clement*, prescribe; *That Presbyters and Deacons, may not ordain other Priests and Deacons, but Bishops only*. And the p *Council of Hispalis or Spaw*, about the year 657. Canon. 5. 7. *out of Pope Leo*, *Epist.* 86. decrees *that Presbyters and Choral Bishops, which are all one, should not presume to ordain Priests or Deacons, or to consecrate Altars or Churches*;

n See David is Blandell. Apologia sect. 3. p. 120. to 13[illegible]. De Chorepiscopis.

* See Cooks censura Patrom.

o Consti. Apost. l. 4. c. 10, 11, 20.

p Surius Tom. 2. p. 7. 19 Tom. [illegible] p. 800.

(s) Exod. 40. Churches; For in holywrit, by Gods command, (s) Moses only erected the Altar in the tabernacle of the Lord; he only annointed it, because he was the High Priest of God, as it is written; (t) Moses and Aaron amongst his Priests. Therefore, that which was commanded only to the cheif Priests to do, of whom Moses and Aaron were a Type, Presbyters who carry the figure of the sons of Aaron, may not presume to encroach upon. For although they have in most things a common dispensation of Mysteries with Bishops, yet they must know, that some things are notwithstanding prohibited them by the authority of the old Law, some things BY NEW ECCLESIASTICAL RULES (or CANONS) as the CONSECRATION OF PRESBYTERS, DEACONS, and virgins; as also the Constitution, Benediction, or Unction of the Altar. Verily it is not lawfull for them to consecrate Churches or Altars, not to give the Holy Ghost the comforter by imposition of hands to the faithfull who are to be baptised, or to those who are converted from heresie, nor to make Chrism, nor to sign the fore head of those that are baptised with Chrism, (u) nor yet publikely to reconcile any penitent person in the masse, nor to send formed Epistles to any. All these things are unlawfull to Presbyters or Choral Bishops, because they have not Pontificatus apicem, the highest degree of the High Priest-hood, which by the AUTHORITY OF THE CANONS, is commanded to be due only to Bishops, that by this the distinction of the degrees, and the hight of the dignity of the High Priest, might be demonstrated. Neither shall it be lawfull for the Presbyter to enter into the Baptistory before the Bishops presence, not to Baptise or sign an Infant, the Bishop being present, nor to reconcile penitents without the Bishops command, nor to consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ he being present, nor in his presence to teach, or bless, or salute the people, no nor yet to exhort them, all which things are known to be prohibited by the (x) See Apostolick. These two last authorities are the cheif the Papists, Jesuits, and our Prelates insist on, to prove that the power of ordination belongs only to Bishops not to Presbyters.

(t) Psal. 98.

(u) See Concil. Carthag. 2. An. 428. c. 3. 4. Gratian Causa. 20 qu. 6. Conc Carthag. 3. c. 36 Gratian Causa. 16. qu. 6.

(x) Leo Epist. 86

But to remove these two obstacles: consider. First, that there is not a word in either of these two Constitutions, (restraining Ministers more from baptising, consecrating the

Lord-

Lords Supper, and Preaching then, or as much as from Ordaining Ministers) that the power of Ordination, belongs only to Bishops by divine right and institution; or that Presbyters by Gods Law have no power to ordain Ministers and Deacons, the thing only in question.

Secondly, That this Council expresly resolves, that *the power and right of ordination is prohibited to Presbyters, and appropriated only to Bishops, not by any Law of God*, or antient Constitutions of the Apostles, or those who immediately succeeded them, *but only by some Ecclesiastical Canons and Constitutions then newly made*, and *by the authority only of the See of Rome*; wich cannot deprive Ministers of that power of ordination, which the Scripture and God himself hath given them (*a*) The rather, because these Canons and Constitutions monopolizing the sole power and right of Ordination to Bishops, were made by Popes and Bishops themselves; who by the (*b*) Civil, (*c*) Common (*d*) Canon Law, *ought not to be Judges or Arbytrators*, (much less sole Judges) *in their own causes and controversies, nor to determine the rights, bounds of their own Jurisdiction, or to exalt themselves by debasing and prejudicing their fellow Ministers, through force, power, or terror, or to take advantage of their own wrong and usurpation over them in their divine rights*, which God himself hath equally conferred on them: especially because the very *Roman Pontifical* it self, set forth by Pope *Clement* the 8. and the Romish Pontifs, allow yea enjoyn Preists and Ministers, to joyn with Bishops in the imposition of hands and ordination of Priests and Ministers, and in their examination before they be ordained. Witness these Rubricks. (*e*) *Quando Episcopus Ordinationes facere disposuerit, &c. Episcopus* SACERDOTIBUS *& aliis prudentibus viris, peritis divinæ legis, ac in Ecclesiasticis functionibus exercitatis* SIBI ASCITIS, *ordinandorum genus, personam, ætatem, institutionem, mores, doctrinam & fidem diligenter investiget. & examinet.* At his ordination, *Pontifex stans ante faldestorium suum, &c. imponit simul utramque manum super caput cujuslibet ordinandi successive, nihil dicens*, IDEMQUE FACIUNT POST EUM OMNES SACERDOTES QUI ADSUNT. *Quo facto, tam Pontifex quam Sacerdotes*, TENENT MANUS DEXTERAS EXTENSAS SUPER ILLOS. *Et*

a See Concil. Spalense 2. ca. 5. Surius Tom. 2. p. 719. Gratian distinct. 24.

b Codicis l. 22 tit. 5. c. 1. Digest. l. 50. Tit 17 sect. 45, 54, 74, 170, 175, 156, 206. Davidis Blondelli Apologia, p 178, 179.

c Cooks 1 Instit. p 141 Littleton sect 212.

d Gratian Distinct. 4 c. 4.

e Pontificale Romanum, Clementis octa 1. 1 Antuerp. 1627 p 4. 40, 42. De Ordinatione Presbyteri.

Pontifex stans cum mitra dicit. Oremus, FRATRES *charissimi, Deum patrem Omnipotentem, ut super hos famulos suos, quos ad Presbyterii munus elegit, cœlestia dona multiplicet, &c.* And if the Pope and Popish Bishops allow ordinary Preists and Ministers a joint right and authority in the imposition of hands, and examination and ordination of Ministers in the Church of *Rome* it self, how can or dare our Bishops or Prelatical Clergy deny this right and power to Protestant Ministers in the Church of *England*, and appropriate it to themselves alone?

Thirdly, These Councils resolve that after the Apostles times before these late Canons, and Constitutions, Presbyters might lawfully ordain Ministers, and Deacons.

Fourthly, That the cheif reason why the power of ordination was in some sort taken from Ministers, and thus monopolized to Bishops, (only by their own Constituions, wherein they have ever favoured themselves,) *was only to advance the power, authority, dignity, ambition, pride of the Pope and prelates, and to distinguish them in degree and order from ordinary Ministers*, which of right are, and otherwise would be their equals, both in Jurisdiction, power and degree, ordination it self as well as Preaching &c.

Fifthly, That they bring not one syllable out of the new Testament, to prove that the power of ordination belongs only to Bishops, not to Ministers; which they would have certainly done, had there been any Text to warrant it; but that all they allege is out of the Old Testament; to wit, *that Moses only consecrated the Tabernacle and the Altar; Ergo none but Bishops must consecrate Ministers, Altars, Churches.* A learned Argument; Ergo none but Kings, and Temporal Magistrates, no, not Bishops themselves, may do it, had been a better consequent. For *Moses* was no Priest, much lesse a Bishop; or High Priest, (which was x *Aarons office*, not his, there being but (y) one High Priest at once, and he a (z) type of our High Priest Christ) but a civil Magistrate; yet God commanded him (a) to consecrate *Aaron with his Sons, the Tabernacle and Altar; and after* him, (b) *King Solomon* (not the High Priest) *consecrated the Temple, Altar, Court, and all the furniture of the Temple and Altar*: So that if these examples

x Exod. 28. 1, to 43. c. 29. 5, to 45. c. 30. 7. to 30. Heb. 5. 4, 5. c. 9. 11.
y Numb. 25. 35.
z Heb. 4. 14. 15. c. 5. 1. to 11. c. 6. 20. c. 7. 22, to 28. c. 8. 1. to 7. c. 9. 1, to 8. c. 10. 11. to 23.
a Exod. 29. 1, &c. 9. 6. 30. 2, to 31. c. 40. 1, to 34.
b 1. King 8. 2 Chron. 6. & 8.

prove any thing, it is but this alone: That the power of ordination, of consecrating Bishops, Ministers, Churches, Altars, &c. appertains not to Archbishops, Bishops, Popes, Priests, Ministers, but to the chief Temporal Magistrates. But admit that *Moses* was a Priest, or an High Priest, and that the power of consecrating Priests, Temples, Altars, appertained to him in that regard; yet this is no argument to prove, that the right and power of Ordination should now belong to Bishops only; and that for these three reasons.

First, because the *Aaronical Priesthood was* (a) *utterly extinct and abolished by Christ, as merely typical and ceremonial*; and so all the appurtenances thereunto belonging.

a Heb 7, & 8, 9, & 10.

Secondly, Because the High Priest was no emblem, type, Pattern or resemblance of Bishops, which are many, changeable, mortal, *but* (b) *only of Christ our true High Priest, who is but one, and remains an high Priest for ever without succession or change.* So that this allusion proves the power of ordaining Ministers to belong originally to none but (c) Christ, *our* (d) *High Priest, chief Shepheard, and* (e) *Bishop of our Souls*, as the (f) *Scripture expressly resolves*; and Ministerially, secondarily, to (g) *every Minister of Christ, as his Ambassador, instrument, and Vicegerent.*

b Augustin. Serm. 99. de tempore. Whitaker, Contr. 4. qu. 1. c. 2. Willet, Synopsis Papismi. Cont. 5. q. 3.

Thirdly, Because, the Office and power of the High Priests and Bishops are different, distinct, yea incompatible one with the other; and the manner of ordination of Priests and Levites under the Law, different from that of Ministers and Deacons under the Gospel, as the (h) *Scriptures*, and (i) all *Authors* joyntly witness: *the one of them therefore can be no solid, or convincing argument to make good the Authority, Jurisdiction, or Practice of the other.* So that this Council and Constitution, makes nothing against the Divine Right and Title of Presbyters to ordain, or for the Bishops sole Monopoly of imposition of hands, by any divine Charter from Christ or the Holy Ghost.

c Heb 5. 14 19. c, 5. 1. 10, 11. c 6. 20. c 7, & 8, 9, & 10. d Heb 6. 20. e Heb 13 20 1 Pet 5. 4. f 1 Pet 2. 25. g Mat. 18. 19, &c. c 28. 19. Mark 16. 15. John 15, 16. Ephes. 4. 8. 11, 12, 13. 1 Tim 4. 14. Acts 13. 1, 2, 3. h Exod c 29. & 30. compared with Acts 6, 1, 10. & 14. 23. 13. 6. 1, 2, 3. Tit. 1. 5. 1 Tim 4. 14. c 5. 12. i Gersomus Buscrus de Guhernat. Eccles. p. 264, 265, 268, 291, 299, 308, 309, 346, 501, 502.

Finally, Neither of these Councils or Constitutons simply debar Ministers from the imposition of hands on others together with the Bishop, which they (k) *ever practised, and were authorised to do, both by God himself, and the fourth Council of Carthage, Can.* 3. But from laying on hands and ordaining Ministers of themselves alone, without the Bishop, (when there was one) who *cannot ordain, or lay hands on any Minister by vertue of those constitutions without them.* Since therefore the Bishop of himself alone cannot impose hands on any Minister without their assistance or consent, nor they without the Bishops, it is apparent, that the right of ordination is not wholly and originally vested in the Bishop, by any Divine or humane right, but equally and joyntly in them both.

k *Acts* 13. 3. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *The Rhemists with all late Commentators, Ibidem & some antients too. David's Blondelli Apologia Sect.* 3. *Voetius, Desperata Causa Papatus, lib.* 2. *sect.* 2.

If any should here object, that the Bishops assembled in the 2 *Council* of Spaw (*Concilium Spalense*) in the year 657. under King *Sisebut* Cap. 5. upon the information of *Agabiensis* a Deacon, that two of his Church were consecrated Deacons, and one a Presbyter in this manner; that their Bishop, being detained with the pain of his eyes, was reputed only to have imposed his hands upon them; and a certain Presbyter to have given the benediction to them; contrary to Ecclesiastical orders thereupon decreed, that the Presbyter for this his great *presumption might have been justly censured by them, were he living; but because he was exempted from humane judgment by death, those who remained and received from him, not the* Title of consecration, but an *Elogy of Ignominy*, *ne sibi licentiam talia usurpatio faciat*, decreed, (without examining the fact or hearing the parties) *Ut à gradu sacerdotalis vel levitici Ordinis, quem perverse adepti sunt, deponiti, æquo judicio abjiciantur; Tales enim merito judicati sunt removendi, quia prave inventi sunt constituti*, which *Gratian* cites as the judgment and advice of Pope *Simplicius* directed to *Severus* and *Florentinus* who were Bishops, and then adds; that it was thus decreed in the Council of *Toledo*, which he mistakes for *Spalense*. To which I answer first, that whatever the advice was, though *Papal* or *Canonical*, it was hardly *Apostolical* or *Evangelical*, and their proceedings directly contrary to the very next Canon of

1 *Surius Concil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 719 *Gratian. distinct.* 24.

Concilium

Concilium Spalense cap. 6. *Ut juxta priscorum patrum synodalem Sententiam, nullus nostrum sine concilii examine dejicere quemlibet Presbyterum vel diaconum audeat. Nam multi sunt qui indiscussos* POTESTATE TYRANNICA NON AUTHORITATE CANONICA DAMNANT. 2. This proceeding in case of the Bishops infirmity, nuls the Bishops imposition of hands in point of ordination, as well as the Presbyters *Benediction* after it; & obligeth Bishops themselves (though blind or infirm) to read and pronounce the benedictions, collects, and prayers used at the ordinations of Ministers and Deacons, without assistance of any Presbyter or Vicar, as well as to lay hands upon them; and by the same reason to *Preach* at such solemnities, as well as to pray; which few Bps. use to do. But to leave this Council, and proceed: *The* (m) *Council of Aquisgran or Aken, under Ludovicus Pius* An. 816. c. 8. out of *Isidor Hispalensis De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, l.* 2. c. 7. determines thus: *The dispensation of the Mysteries of God are committed to Presbyters as they are to Bishops: for they are over the Church of Christ, and are consorts with Bishops in the confection of the body and blood of Christ, and likewise also in the instruction of the people, and in the office of preaching; and only the ordination and Consecration of Clerks is reserved to the high Priest or* (b) *Bishop, because of his authority, lest the Discipline of the Church, challenged or exercised by many, should dissolve concord and ingender scandals; For* Paul *the Apostle calls Elders and Priests by the name of Bishops,* Tit. 1. 5, 7. Acts 20. 28. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. *D. Rabanus Maurus De Instit. Clericorum, l.* 1. c. 6. writes thus: *That Presbyters although they be Priests, yet they have not attained the top or highest degree of Priesthood, because they cannot sign the fore-head with Chrism, nor give the holy Ghost; neither can they ordain Clerks in sacred orders, which is reserved to Bishops for unity and concord sake. The Epistle de 7. Gradibus Ecclesiæ in the ninth Tome of Jerroms works, avers in* expres terms; *that the ordination of Clerks and consecration of Virgins was reserved only to the High-Priest or Bishop for his greater honour. And Tertullian de Baptism. c.* 17. writes, *that the High Priest, who is the Bishop, hath the right of giving Baptism, after him Presbyters and Deacons;*

m *Surius Tom.* 3. *p.* 239.

n *By Canons made only by Bishops themselves not Christ or his Apostles.*

cons; yet not without the Bishops authority, for the honor of the Church; By all which it is evident, that Bishops have not the sole executive power of ordination by any divine right or institution (of which there is not one syllable, either in these or other Councils of Fathers) but only by (l) Canons and humane Constitutions, made by Popes and Bishops themselves, to advance their own honour, power, pomp and dignity: yet notwithstanding the right of ordination remaines still in Ministers; and belongs to Bishops, only as they ate Ministers by divine right, not as they are Bishops; as is evident by the (m) 9. Chapter of the same Council of Aken, taken out of *Isidor. De Eccles. Officiis, l.* 2. c. 6. where writting of Bishops ordination by imposition of hands, and the original thereof, they use this expression, (which (n) *H. Rabanus Maurus*, likewise hath:) *But that Bishops are ordained by imposition of hands,* A PRÆCESSORIBUS DEI SACERDOTIBUS, *by the Priests of God their predecessors, is an antient constitution. For the holy* (o) *Patriark Isaac laying his hands upon the head of Jacob, blessed him, and* (p) *Jacob in like manner gave a benediction to his sons, &c.* Where the Council and Fathers both affirm, that even Bishops themselves are ordained by *Priests or Presbyters* (not Bishops) *their Predecessors*; therefore the right and power of ordaining Ministers (and Bishops too) belongs to Presbyters as well as Bishops, and to Bishops only as Presbyters, not Bishops; and so can no waies advance them in Jurisdiction, order, or degree above Ministers. The Popish (q) *Council of Trent, Sessio 23. De Sacramento Ordinis c.* 4. determines, *that Bishops are superior to Presbyters, and that they can confer the Sacrament of Confirmation, ordain Ministers of the Church, and do many other things, which these inferior orders have no power to do. And Can.* 7. *De Sacramento Ordinis: If any shall say, that Bishops are not superior to Priests, or that they have not the power of ordination, or confirmation; or that this power, which they have, is common to them with Presbyters; or that the orders conferred by them without the consent or calling of the secular power are void, let him be Anathema:* Lo here this Council appropriates the power of ordination only to Bishops, by denying it to be common

l *Alex. Alensis Sum. Pars* 4. *q.* 9. *m.* 5. *art.* 1.

m *Surius Ibid. p.* 33c.

n *De Instit. Clericorum l.* 1. *c.* 4.

o *Gen.* 27. *and* 28.

p *Gen.* 28

q *Surius Tom.* 4. *p.* 965.

common to them with Ministers, and in this regard makes Bishops superior in degree to Ministers; yet not by any divine right or institution, (of which there is not one word) but only by humane and Canonical; (as the (r) *History of the Council of Trent*, and (f) *Chemnitius well observe:*) For in the same (t) *Session de Reform. Can.* 7. 8. it enjoyns; *that according to the antient Canons,* (& *the Roman Pontifical too*) *when Ministers or Deacons ar to be ordained, that the Bishop calling to him the Priests and other Prudent men, skilful of the divine Law, and exercised in Ecclesiastical constitutions, should diligently enquire and examin before them the stock, person, age, institution, manners, doctrin, and faith of those that were to be ordained; and that those orders should be publickly conferred and celebrated in the Cathedral Church; the Canons of the Church being called to, and present at it; or if in any other place, or Church of the Diocesse,* Præsenti Clero Loci, *the Clergy of the place being present.* (u) Pope *Anacletus* and the (x) *Canon Law, having long before that time ordained, That Priests and Deacons should be ordained by their own Bishops*; Ita ut Cives & Alii SACERDOTES assensum præbent; *So as the Citizens and other Priests assented thereunto; which they usually did, and ought to do, as Gratian* with (y) *others prove at large.* So that though this Council, and the other Canons and Constitutions debar Presbyters and Ministers from the act and exercise of ordination, (which yet they ever used, and practised as assistants to the Bishops, who can ordain none but by their assent, since they ought to joyn with them in the imposition of hands) yet they deprive them not of their inherent right, nor of the exercise of it as assistants to the Bishop, which they have ever used. I pass now from these Councils and Constitutions to the Fathers, who jump in judgement with them. It is true that (z) *St. Hierom*, (t) *Epiphanius*, (b) *Isidor Hispalensis* (c) *Ambrose*, (d) *Augustine*, (e) *Leo*, *and* (f) *others* affirm, that *Bishops only in their times* (yet assisted by the Presbyters who joyned with them in the ordination and imposition of hands)

r *Lib.* 7. [*Examen Concil. Tridentini.*

t *par.* 2. *De Sacramento Ordinis ibid. p.* 968.

u *Epist.* 2. c. 2. *apud Surium, Tom.* 1. *p.* 61. *recited by Gratian. Dist.* 67.

x *Gratian. Distinct.* 61, 62, 63, 64, *&c.*

y *Illyr. catalogus Testium veritatis. Anno* 1562 *Append. p.* 23 1 56, *Vera demonstratio, quod Electio Præsulum & Episcoporum non ad Ecclesiasticos solum, sed & ad Laicos quos Docant, pertineat, quodque hi hoc iure Electionis inde usque à Christi tempore annis* 1600. *usi sunt*

z *Epist. ad Evagrium. & in Tit.* 1.

a *Cont. hæresd.* 3. *hæres.* 75.

b *De Eccles. Officiis l.* 2 *c.* 7.

c *In Eccles.* 4. *and* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. d *Quæstiones ex utroque Test. mixtim. quæst* 101. e *Epist.* 86. f *Aquinas Supplementum Quæst.* 38. *Artic.* 1.

did

did use to ordain Ministers and Deacons; and that Presbyters might do all things that Bishops did, except the confering of Orders, and some other trifles, as consecrating of Altars, Churches, Virgins, Chrisme, &c. not warranted by Gods words; yet none of them determine, that the right and power of ordination belongs only to Bishops, by divine institution and appointment; that Presbyters have no right at all by the word of God to confer Orders; or that they might not do it in any case; but they expressly aver the contrary; for as they did *joyn with the Bishop in the imposition of hands*, as appears by the 3d. Canon of the 4th. Council of Carthage, forecited; So in S. *Ambrose his time, in Ægypt, if the Bishop were absent, the Presbyters use to consign and confer orders; as this* (g) *Father* testifieth: and (h) St. *Austine* records, *That in Alexandria, and throughout all Egypt, if the Bishop were wanting, the Presbyters conferred orders.* Which is likewise attested by *Rabanus Maurus* in *Epist. ad Regenbald.* by *Burchardus l. 6. de sacramentis*, *Beatus Rhenanus his Annotations*, on *Tertullian de Corona Militis. p. 733, 734.* & *Claudius Espencæus Digressionum in 1 Tim. l. 1. c. 2.* Hence *Aerius* (as (i) *Epiphanius* reports his words) reasoned in this manner: 'What 'is a Bishop to a Presbyter? one differs nothing from the 'other; it is one order (*saith he*) one honor, and one dignity. '*Imposit manus Episcopus*; (k) ITA ETIAM PRESBYTER: 'The Bishop imposeth his hands, or ordains Ministers, so likewise doth the Presbyter; the Bishop baptizeth, so also doth the Presbyter; the Bishop sits in a Throne, so also doth the Presbyter. And he also alledged, that the Apostle saith to a Bishop, (l) Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which thou hast received by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. 'Epiphanius there denyeth not directly, that the Presbyters then did use to ordain; but demands, 'How it is possible for a Presbyter to ordain, not having imposition of hands in the election of Ministers, or to say that he was equal with a Bishop? A false and miserable shift: since all (m) Histories, Fathers, Authors, Councils testifie, that in that age, Presbyters had always their voyces in the Election, yea their hands in the

g *Ambros. in Ephes. 4.*

h *Quæst. ones ex utroque Testamento mixt. quæst. 101.*

i *Const. Hæres. l. 3. Tom. 1 Hær. 75.*

k *See Cent Magd. 3. De Ritibus circa vocationem & ordinationem, col 135.*

l *1 Tim. 4. 14.*

m *Appendix Catalogo Testium veritatis p. 22. to 6. Gerson mus Bucerus. De Gubernat Eccles. p 25, 130, 231, 318, usque 334, 346, usque 354, 360, 361, 363, 364, 414, 609. Davidis Blondelli Apologia.*

ordi-

c ordination of Ministers and Deacons. ‖*Firmilianus* in his E- ‖ *Cypriani opera Edit. Parisiis*
pistle to S. *Cyprian*, about 230 years after our Saviours Na- *Epist. 75. l.*
tivity, asserts, that the power of Ordination as well as of Bap- *15.*
tising belongs to Presbyters: *Quando omnis potestas & gratia in Ecclesia constituta sit, ubi præsident MAJORES NATU, qui & baptizandi, ET MANUM IMPONENDI, ET ORDINANDI POSSIDENT POTESTATEM.* And St. *Cyprian* himself in his 33. & 58. Epistles, *Presbyteris & Diaconibus*, relates, that Presbyters, his Colleagues, joyned with him in the ordination of *Aurelius*; and that none were ordained but by their Common Counsel, and weighing of their merits. *In* (a) *ordinationibus Clericis, fratres charissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, & mores & merita singulorum COMMUNI CONSILIO PONDERARE, &c.* After which, extolling the merits of *Aurelius*, though young in years, he subjoyns, *Hunc igitur fratres dilectissimi a me & COLLEGIS QUI PRÆSENTES ADERANT ORDINATUM SCIATIS; quid vos scio & libenter amplecti.* And in his 68. Epistle he adds, that in the Election and ordination of Priests and Bishops, the (b) people have the greatest power, *vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. Quod & ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut Sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis delegatur, & dignus atque idoneus* PUBLICO JUDICIO AC TESTIMONIO COMPROBETUR: which he proves at large by *Numb.* 10. *Acts* 2. & 6. and other Texts. And then concludes, *propter quod diligenter de traditione divina, & apostolica observatione observandum est & tenendum, quod apud nos quoque, & (c) fere per universas Provincias tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui Præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, & unius cujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit, &c.* St. *Hieron in his* Commentary *on Zeph.* c. 2. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 218. *D.* writes expresly. c *SACERc DOTES, &c.* That Priests and Presbyters who give Baptism c and imprecate the Lords Advent to the Eucharist, make also c the oyl of Chrism, MANUS IMPONUNT, impose hands, in- c struct the Catechumeni, LEVITAS ET ALIOS CONSTI-

TUUNT

a Ordinands.

b Even among the Pagan Romans, the High Priests was elected, by the suffrage of the people. Inde omnia opuscula Pontificibus creandis sæpe indicta fuere *Alexander ab Alexandro, Genial. l. 2. c. 8.* c *Tertul. Apol. c. 39 Amir. Epist. 32 Gratian. cus. qu. 1. cons. E. qu. 3.*

'TUUNT SACERDOTES; ordain Levites, and other 'Priests. Therefore Presbyters in S. *Hieroms* time ordained Ministers, Deacons, and layd on their hands as well as Bishops. Yea (a) *Anastatius*, in the life of Pope *Pelagius the first*, records, *that this Pope An. Christi* 555. *for want of three Bishops to ordain him, was ordained* Pope, *by John Bishop of Perusia, and Bonus Bishop of Florence, and Andreas Presbyter de Hostia, which Luitprandius de Vitis Pontificum, p.* 84. *and Albo Floriacensis in his life, p.* 140. likewise testifie: Lo here a Presbyter or ordinary Minister ordaining not only another Elder, but a Bishop, yea a Pope; and supplying the place of a Bishop; (b) *the general Council of Nice. Can.* 4. *the first Council of Arelat. Can.* 21. *the Second Council of Carthage, Can.* 12. *the third Council of Carthage, Can.* 19. *the Council of Aphricke, Can.* 16. *the Council of Rhegium, An.* 472. *the Council of Arausica, Can.* 21. *the Council of Chalcedon, Act.* 13. *p.* 187. with sundry Popes Decrees, ordaining, *that no man shall be consecrated a Bishop, but by three Bishops at least, and that consecration made only by two Bishops shall be void*; and so this Pope no lawfully ordained Pope, unless that this Presbyter supplyed the place of a Bishop in his consecration, and his Ordination were good and vaild by the Law of God, though invalid, and a mere nullity by these Canons. (c) *Anno.* 1399, about 'John *Wicklifs* time there arose in *England* certain bold 'Clerks, who affirmed, that it was lawful for them to 'make new Presbyters and Clerks, and confer orders, like 'Bishops: teaching likewise, that they were endued with 'the same power in Ecclesiastical affairs as Bishops were, 'whereupon they layd hands on many, and ordained divers Ministers: who affirmed likewise that they had equal and the 'selfesame Eccleasiastical power with Bishops, which was the constant Doctrine of *Wickliffe* and the (d) *Waldenses*. This Doctrine of theirs was true, but their practice discommended; yet the Ministers thus ordained by them, held their ordination lawful by Gods law; yea and their ordination of others in those times of darkness and persecution, was good and valid, when no *Wickliffists*, *Lollards* or other orthodox Professors

a *De Vitis Pontificum p.* 58.

b *See Surius Council. Tom.* 1. *p.* 188. 261, 363. 341, 369, 376, 406, 502, 506, 574. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 187, 656, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 699, 718, 467. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 624. 267, 268, 272, 6, &c. 731.

c *Antiqu. Eccl Brit. p.* 30.

d *See Usserius de statu & successione Eccles. c.* 9. 10.

fessors of the Gospel could be admitted into orders by the Bishops of that age, unless they would subscribe to their Popish assertions, as some of our Prelates now will admit none to receive orders, unless they will first subscribe to such private positions and Ceremonies, as are directly contrary to the established doctrine, and discipline of the Church of *England*; by meanes whereof many Godly men are kept from the Ministery. And though (*a*) *Chrysostome*, *Primasius*, *Theodoret*, *Ambrose*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, *Haymo*, with some others, interpret that of the 1 Tim.4.14. *By the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, to be meant either of* Paul *himself, or of the Senate of the Apostles, or of such who had Apostolical Authority, or of Bishops, and not of meer Presbyters; because* (say they) *Presbyters* (to wit, according to the practice of their, though not of former times) *could not ordain a Bishop, but onely Apostles, or Bishops*; yet none of them so much as once affirm, that they cannot by the Law of God ordain Deacons, and ordinary Ministers; or that they ought by Gods Law and Divine Institution to be ordained onely by Bishops, or that Presbyters ordination is void: yea, *Theophyl.* on that text writes thus, *Behold a wonderful thing, See how much the imposition* SACERDOTALIUM MANUUM, of *Sacerdotal or Priests hands can do*; A clear demonstration, that Priests as well as Bishops, and Bishops onely as they are Priests, not Bishops, have power of laying on hands. And (*b*) *Theodoret*, thus glosseth the text, *here he calls those the Presbytery who had attained Apostolical grace*; *For*, saith he, *divine Scripture hath called those who were honored in Israel Elders*. The Fathers therefore confessing, that Presbyters and Elders might and did in some cases and places Ordain, and Consecrate Ministers without the Bishop, and likewise joyn with the Bishop (in all places) in the imposition of hands; grant that the right of Ordination and imposing of hands, belongeth to them by the Word of God, as well as to Bishops; the rather, because this is the constant doctrine of the (*c*) *Fathers*, that *Bishops and Presbyters, by Gods Law and institution, are both one and the same, and so continued till long after the Apostles times*; therefore their power of Ordination, the same

a *In* 1 *Tim* 4. 14. see Claud. *Espencaus* Tim. *Digress.* l.1.c.1.

In 1 *Tim.* 4 14

b *In* 1 *Tim.* 4.14

c *Ambrose in Eph.* 4. & 1 *Tim.* 3. *Hierom. Sedulius, Theodoret, Primasius, Rabanus Maurus, Remigius, Oecumenius, Theophyl. Alselmus, Beda, Bruno, &c. in Phil.* 1.1. 1 *Tim.* 3. *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. *Act* 20.17, 28.

a In 1 Tim. 4. 14. Lect. 3.

with theirs. Neither do the Papists dissent from this (a) *Aquinas* writes, 'That the imposition of hands belongs onely to 'those who are the Ministers of Christ; which was double, one 'which was made by Deacons, the other by Ministers; and because he addes not the third by Bishops, he plainly intimates, that the ordination made by Ministers and Bishops, is one and the same, and that Bishops ordain onely as Ministers, not as Bishops. (b) *Cajetan* on that Text saith, 'That *Paul* relates, 'that the imposition of hands, SACERDOTALIS OFFICII, 'is a part of the Sacerdotal or Priests office (not the Bishops) And *Faber* in 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. writes, that 'Presbyters did use to 'lay their hands on the heads of those who were to be ordained, purged, or made compleat Ministers, pouring forth holy prayers. I know indeed, that (c) *Aquinas* and other *Schoolmen* hold, 'that it belongs onely to Bishops to confer holy orders; yet he, with *Durandus* and *Alensis* grant, 'That this is 'not by vertue of any Divine Right, or Institution, but onely 'by humane Constitutions and Canons, by reason of the 'more excellent power and jurisdiction that the Bishop hath 'over and above Ministers, and for order sake; yea, they both affirm, 'That Presbyters do, and ought to joyn with 'the Bishop in the imposition of hands in the ordination of Ministers. The *Rhemists* in their Annotations on the 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. confess, 'That when a Priest is ordained, the rest of the 'Priests and Elders present, do together with the Bishop, even 'at this day among them (and have anciently used heretofore) to lay hands on those that are to be ordained; citing the *fourth Council of* Carthage: *can.* 3. for proof thereof. And the (d) *Canonists*, with some (e) *Schoolmen* grant, 'That 'Priests and Ministers by the Popes Dispensation and License, 'may without a Bishops concurrence ordain Deacons and Ministers; but a meer Lay-man, or one that is no Minister, can-'not do it. A clear proof, that the imposition of hands appertains to Presbyters as well as Bishops, and that the power of ordination rests more in the Ministers person, then in the Popes grant or License; else why might not a Lay-man as well as a Minister, grant Orders by vertue of the Popes License, or why should Ministers joyn with Bishops in the imposition

b In 1 Tim. 4. 14.

c Supplementum Qu. 38. Arti. 1. In 4 Sent. Dist. 24. Q. 5. 6. Alensis Summ. pars 4 qu. 9 m. 5. art 1

d Summa Angelica Ordo Sect 13 and Innocentius there cited. e Filiuc. Iesuita De Casibus conse. pars 1 Tract 9 c 5 Alex Alensis Sum. Theol. pars 4 qu 9 m. 5 Artic. 1

of hands? But to paſs from theſe to the reformed Churches beyond the Seas. We know that moſt of them have no Biſhops, that all their Miniſters and Deacons are ordained by the common Election of the people, and Magiſtrates, and impoſition of the Senate or Colledge of Miniſters hands; yet none of our Prelates (till * ſome of late) have been ſo impudently ſhameleſs, as to deny their ordination and Miniſters to be lawful, or their practice to be diſſonant from the Scriptures, or them to be true Churches. What their Writers have determined concerning the power of Ordination, incident to Miniſters as well as Biſhops, and to Biſhops onely as Miniſters, and ſervants to the Church, not Lords over it, theſe enſuing paſſages will declare: (a) *Johannes Luckawits* in his *Confeſſion of the Taborites againſt Rokenzana*, c. 13. *of the Sacrament of Order*, writes thus, 'They confeſs, that the con-'ferring of orders onely by Biſhops, and that they have more 'effectual authority of this nature then other Miniſters, is not 'from any faith or authority of the Scriptures, *Sed ex conſue-'tudine habetur eccleſiæ*, but from the cuſtom of the *Church*. This being the *conſtant doctrine of the* (b) *Waldenſes and Taborites*, 'That the power of giving orders, and impoſing hands, be-'longed to Presbyters as well as Biſhops, and that Biſhops and 'Miniſters by Gods Law were both one; and no Biſhop great-'er then any Presbyter in honor, or juriſdiction. (c) *Melanthon* writes, 'That if Biſhops and Ordinaries are enemies of 'the Church, or will not give orders, yet the Churches retain 'their right; for whereſoever there is a Church, there is a right 'of adminiſtring the Goſpel; wherefore there is a neceſſity that 'the Church ſhould retain the right of calling, electing and 'ordaining Miniſters. And this right is a gift given to the 'Church, which no humane authority can take from the 'Church; as *Paul* witneſſeth, *Epheſ.* 4. where he ſaith, *When he aſcended up on high, he gave gifts unto men*; and he reckons Doctors and Paſtos among the proper gifts of the Church; and 'addes, that ſuch are given for the work of the Miniſtery, for 'the edifying of the body of Chriſt, &c. where therefore there 'is a true Church, there muſt needs be a right of electing and 'ordaining Miniſters. One thing had made a difference of

† See Canterburies Doom, p 385, 390, 332

a Lydii Waldenſia, p 23

b Fox Acts and Monuments, p 210 Illyr. catal. Teſtium veritatis, tit. Waldenſes, p 455

c Argument. & Reſponſ. pars 7 De Poteſtate Epiſcopi, Arg. 2

c Bishops and Pastors, to wit, ordination, because it is instituted
c (by Bishops and Bishops Canons) that one Bishop might or-
c dain in many c Churches; but seeing that by Gods Law there
c are not divers degrees of a Bishop and Pastor, it is evident,
c that an ordination made by a Pastor in his Church, is
c ratified by Gods Law. *Marsilius Patavinus* in his *Defe-
sor. Pacis*, *pars* 2. c. 15. 17. *affirms*, c that the power of
c ordaining Ministers, belongs not to Priests and Bishops,
c but to the Magistrates and people, where he is to be a
c Minister. That every Priest by Divine authority, may con-
c fer all Sacraments, and give orders, as well as any Bishop;
c and that every Priest hath power to ordain and promote any
c Beleiver that is willing to the Priesthood, he preparing him
c Ministerially, but God simply and immediately impressing the
c Sacerdotal power or character; the original property of or-
c daining Ministers being only in Christ, the head of the
a *In* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. c Church. (a) *Hyperius* thus seconds him, c The imposition of
c hands in the election of a Bishop, or Deacon, to approve the
c person to the multitude or people, was made by THE EL-
c DERS, in whom this authority rested, whence it is here
c added, with the *laying on of hands by the authority of the
c Priesthood*, or as it is more significantly and plainly expressed
c in the Greek, with the *laying on of the hands of the Presbyte-
c ry*, which signified the whole Congregation of Elders. And
c they agreed, that he *who was elected by the consent of many*,
c should be commended and approved as a fit person, by
b *In* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. c this external sign. Which is thus backed by * *Hemingius*,
c The imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, is the right
c of ordination, which the SENATE (or Eldership) of the
c Church, or other Ministers of the Gospel did administer.
c Learned *Gerardus*, *Locorum Theolog. De Ministerio Eccleſia-
c stico*, proves at large, That the power of ordination be-
c longs to Presbyters; and that Ministers ordination by Pres-
c byters alone, is a good ordination by the word of God,
c *Argum. & Resp. pars* 7. *De Ordin. Ministr. in Argum.* 1. c refuting the Papists Cavils to the contrary. (c) *Pezelius*
thus jumps in judgement with him. c Heretofore the au-
c thority of Ordination was granted to the Bishops, at least
c by a humane institution; yet so that the suffrages of the
Church

Church might not be excluded from the Election of Ministers, and that the other Presbyters should be present at the examination, and lay their hands together on him, that was to be ordained: For so *Gratian Can. Presbyter. Distinct.* 23. when a Presbyter is ordained, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters likewise that are present, shall hold their hands upon his head, close to the Bishops hands: which tended to this purpose, that the Presbyters likewise might retain the right of consecrating, or ordaining to themselves, and that so they might manifest, that whatever the Bishop should do, that he did it not in his own name alone, but in the name of all. (a) *Musculus* harps upon the same string thus, 'It must plainly be confessed, that the Ministers of Christ heretofore were elected, the people being present and consenting; and they were ordained and confirmed OF THE ELDERS, by the laying on of their hands. This *form of electing Ministers is Apostolical and lawful*; which he there proves at large.

a *Loci Com. De Minist. Verbi Dei.*

The *Noble* (b) *Mornay, Lord of Plessis*, sings the same tune in these words, 'These things being thus proved, we adde, that the right of laying on of hands, and ordaining Ministers, is in the power of the Presbyters. And this verily concerning the Apostles days is more apparent, than that it can be so much as doubted: For saith *Paul* to *Timothy*, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, that is, of the Presbyters or Elders. Moreover *Timothy* himself ordained Elders; and since a Bishop and a Presbyter are names of one and the same function, if the Bishops challenge this right to themselves from the Scriptures, the Presbyters also may do the same: but if they deny it to Presbyters, in this very thing they abrogate this right to themselves. And verily this was a good form of Argument in the Church in Antient times. (c) He can baptize, he can consecrate and administer the Sacrament of the Lords body, (which are the greater and more honourable Actions, because Sacraments of undoubted truth,

b *De Ecclesia cap.* 11.

c *Magist. Sentent. l.* 4. *c.* 25.

c of highest note and use;) Therefore he may lay on hands.
c (which is less:) Now in ordaining Elders, the Bishop
c laying his hands on the heads of those who were to be or-
c dained, the rest of the Elders likewise did lay on their
c hands, as appears out of many places of the Decrees.
a Cent. 1. l. 2 c. 6 Ritus Vocationis & Ordinationis, Col. 502. The (a) Century Writers inform us, c That in the Apo-
c stles time, the Apostles did not assume to themselves the
c power of electing and ordaining Elders and Deacons, but
c they had the suffrage and consent of the whole Church, and
c that they, and the other Ministers of the Church with them,
c did ordain and lay their hands on them; which they prove
c by *Acts* 6. and 13. and 14. and 19. and 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.
And in the second and third Century following, *c.* 6. they af-
firm, c That Bishops and Ministers were thus elected and or-
c dained, the Elders as well as the Bishops laying their hands
Harmony of Confessions, ch. xi p. 232. 236. c on them. The later (b) Confession of *Helvetia*, *Artic.* 17. *of choosing Ministers* resolves, c That this function is to be given
c to none *whom* THE MINISTERS, and they to whom the
c charge is committed by the Church, do not finde and judge
c to be skilful in the Law of God, to be of a blameless life,
c and to have a singular affection to the name of Christ; *Which seeing it is the true* Election *of God, is justly allowed by the consent of the Church*, and BY THE LAYING ON OF THE HANDS OF THE PREISTS (or Presbyters.) Which is
c Ibid. p 236 237. thus seconded by the (c) later *Confession of Helvetia*, c. 18. *Let the Ministers of the Church be called and chosen by a Lawful and Ecclesiastical Election and Vocation, &c. And those that are chosen*, LET THEM BE ORDAINED OF THE ELDERS, WITH PUBLIKE PRAYER & LAYING ON OF HANDS. *Now the power which is given to the Ministers of the Church*, IS THE SAME AND ALIKE IN ALL: *and in the beginning the Bishops or Elders did with a common consent and labour, govern the Church; no man lifted up himself above another; no man usurped greater power or authority over his fellow Bishops; for they remembred the words of the Lord,* (d) He that will be
d Luke 10 chiefest among you, let him be your servant. *They kept in themselves by humility, and did mutually aid one another in the Government and preservation of the Church*, which they prove

by

by *Acts* 15. S. *Cyprian*, *de simplicitate Clericorum*, and *Jerome* on *Titus*, 1. The Bishops must know, that they are above the Priests, rather by custom, then by the prescript rules of Gods truth, and they should have the Government of the Church in common with them. Thus far *Jerome*. *Now therefore no man can forbid by any right*, THAT WE MAY RETURN TO THE OLD APPOINTMENT OF GOD, AND RATHER RECEIVE THAT, THEN THE CUSTOMS DEVISED BY MEN, The Confession (*a*) of *Bohemia*, c. 9. determines, 'That Ministers ought not of their own accord to 'press forwards in that calling; but ought according to the 'examples of the Lord and the Apostles, to be lawfully ordained and appointed thereunto, and that after this manner, 'That from a people which is found in Religion, and feareth 'God (*b*) such men may be chosen and called to the administration of holy Functions, as are strong and mighty in 'faith, fearing God, and having gifts requisite for the Ministery, and be of honest and blameless life. And again, that 'above all things, those be proved and heard by examination, whether they be such; and so afterwards, prayers and 'fastings being made, *THEY MAY BE CONFIRMED AND APPROVED OF THE ELDERS, BY LAYING ON OF HANDS* Of such Priests and Ministers, and of making, ordaining, and consecrating them, and how the ordaining of 'them ought to be handled, the Apostle teacheth evidently & 'plainly in his Epistles to *Timothy* & *Titus*; therefore it is not 'permitted to any among us, to execute the Office of the Ministery, or to administer holy functions of the Lords, unless, 'ACCORDING TO THE ACTIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE 'CHUCHR, AND ORDER APPOINTED BY GOD, HE 'COMES TO HIS FUNCTION, AND BE CALLED AND 'ASSIGNED THEREUNTO. The (*c*) Conf. of *Saxony*, c. 12. resolves, 'That it belongs to the Ministers of the Word to 'ordain Ministers lawfully elected and called. The (*d*) Synod of *Petrocow* (in *Poland*) *Artic.* 6. decreed, 'That no 'Patron should receive or admit any Ministers to teach in 'his Church, unless he were lawfully ordained and sent by 'the Superintendents, and the Elders, and had a good and certain

a Harmony of Confessions, Sect. 11 p 246, 247

b Mat. 10 Rom 1. 6 & 3. Acts 1, 1 Tim. 2 & 3 Heb. 5. Tit. 1.

c Harmon. Confess. pars 2

d See *Gersomus Bucerus de Gubern. Eccl.* p 618.

'certain testimonial from them; and the Synod of *Wlodislavia*, *Artic.* 8. and 12. determines thus, 'The ordination 'and mission of Ministers in certain places to work in the 'Lords Vineyard, is committed to the Superintendents, and 'to the Ministers and Elders their Colleagues; (not to Bi- 'Bishops.) *Georgius Major* in his *Enar. in Philip.* c. 1. writes thus, 'That there is no difference between a Bishop and a 'Presbyter, *Paul* witnesseth in the 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where he 'saith, *Neglect not the grace that is in thee*, &c, *by the lay- 'ing on of the hands of the Presbytery*; that is, of the Order or 'Colledge of the Presbyters: by which it is shewed, That 'Timothy was called and ordained to the Episcopal functi- 'on by the Presbyters. Therefore at that time PRESBY- 'TERS HAD THE RIGHT OF ORDINATION, as well 'as Bishops, neither was there any difference between 'them. To these I might adde *Master John Calvin*, *Pisca- 'tor*, *Marlorat*, and most other Protestant Commentators on 'the 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *Tit.* 1. 3. *Zanchius de statu peccati & Legal. in 'quartum Præceptum*, *Chemnitius Lom. Com. pars* 3. *De Eccles.* 'c. 4. and *Examen Concilii Tridentini pars* 2. *De Sacram. Or- 'dinis*, p. 224, 225, &c. (where he proves at large, 'That 'the election and vocation of Ministers belongs to the whole 'Church, to the people as well as the Clergy; that the im- 'position of hands belongs to Presbyters as well as Bishops. 'Wherefore the Apostle saith, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. that *Timothy* had 'a grace and a gift by the imposition of hands; neither saith 'he onely of my hands, but he addes also of the Presbytery, 'that there should be thought no difference, whether any 'one were ordained either by the Apostles, or by the El- 'ders.) *Antonius Sadeel. Respons. ad Repetita Turriani 'Sophism. pars* 2. *Locus* 12. *Beza de diversis Ministro- 'rum Gradibus. Junius Contr.* 5. l. c. 3. *n.* 3. *Chamierus 'Panstratia Cathol. Tom.* 2. *de Oecum. Pontif.* c. 6. with sun- 'dry (a) other Writers of the reformed Churches, who 'aver and prove at large against the Papists and Jesuits, that 'the power of election and ordination of Ministers by the 'Word of God, belongs to the whole Church and Con- 'gregation, and the imposition of hands to Ministers, 'Elders.

Gul Voetius Desperata causa Papatus, l. 1. sect. 2.

(a) *Presbyteri & Episcopi sunt Iure divino pares, id est, administrant idem officium, eadem auctoritate, unde Presbyteri impositionis manuum in pastoribus ordinandis jus habent.*

Elders, and Presbyters, as well as to Bishops, and * to Bishops only as they are Presbyters. But he that hath handled and proved this most largely and fully of all others, is *Gersomus Bucerus de Gubernat. Ecclesiæ* (being an answer to Bishop *Downhams* Sermon of Bishops) *p.* 261, 262, 283, 287, 292, 294, 299, 310, 318, to 367. 464, 465, 493, 498, 499, 524, 618. & *David Blondellus* Apol. pro. Sent. *Hieron.* sect. 3. p. 309. to 379. (never yet replied unto by any of the Prelatical party) where this point is so learnedly and substantially proved by Scripture, Reason, and Authors of all sorts, that none, which read these passages of theirs, can ever hereafter call this into question more.

1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *Can. Presbyter. Distinct.* 2.

See *Amandus Polanus Syntagm Theol. l.* 7 *c* 11.

Having run thus long abroad, I now in the last place return to our own Church and writers. (a) *Egbert* Archbishop of *York*, about the year of Christ 750. made a collection or excerption out of the Canons of sundry antient Councils, for the Government of his Province, whereof this was the 44. *Episcopus* ABSQUE CONSILLO PRESBYTERORUM CLERICOS NON ORDINET, which was constantly observed till the times of reformation, and then confirmed by two Parliaments, *For the book of ordination of Ministers*, ratified *by two several acts of Parliament*, namely 5 *Edw.* 6. c. 11. *and* 8. *Eliz.* c. 1. *and subscribed to by all our Prelates and Ministers*, (b) *by vertue of the* 36. *Canon, as containing nothing in it contrary to the word of God, expresly orders*, that *when Ministers are ordained*; ALL THE MINISTERS PRESENT AT THE ORDINATION SHALL LAY THEIR HANDS TOGETHER WITH THE BISHOP ON THOSE THAT ARE TO BE ORDAINED: *And the* 35. *Can.* made in Convocation by the Bishop and Clergy *An.* 1603 prescribes, that the *Bishop before he admit any Person to holy Orders, shall diligently examine him in the presence of those Ministers that shall* ASSIST HIM AT THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS. *And if the said Bishop have any lawful impediment, he shall cause the said Ministers carefully to examine every such person so to be ordered. Provided that they who shall assist the Bishop in examining* AND LAYING ON OF HANDS, *shall be of his Cathedral Church, if they may conveniently be had, or other sufficient*

a *Spelm. Conc. p.* 261.

b *Canons* 1603. *can.* 36, 35.

preachers of the same Diocess, to the number of three at the least. And according to this book of Ordination and Canon, when ever any Ministers are ordained, all the Ministers there present joyn with and assist the Bishop in laying on of hands, on every one that is ordained. So that both by the established Doctrine and practice of the Church of *England*, the power of laying on hands, and right of ordination, is common to every one of our Ministers, as well as to our Bishops; who as they cannot ordain or lay hands on any Ministers without the Bishop, so the Bp. can ordain or lay hands on no Ministers without them; so that the power and right of ordination rests equally in them both. With what face or shadow then of truth our Prelates now can or dare to Monopolize this privilege to themselves alone, against two Statutes, the book of Ordination, their own Canons, Subscriptions, yea their own and their Predecessors common practice to the contrary (which perchance their over great imployments in temporal businesses, and secular state affairs, have caused them wholly to forget, as least not to consider:) let the indifferent judge. But to pass from them to some of our learned writers: (*a*) *Alcuinius de Divin. Offic. c.* 37. writes; that ‘ Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons were anciently, and in his ‘ time too, An. 790, 800, elected by the Clergy and people, ‘ and that they were present at their ordination and consenting ‘ to it: that the Bishops consecration in his daies used in the ‘ Church of Rome, wherein two Bishops held the Gospel or ‘ New Testament over the head of the Bishop consecrated, ‘ and a third uttered the blessing, after which the other Bi- ‘ shops present laid their hands on his head, was but a Novel- ‘ ty, not found in the Old or New Testament, nor in the ‘ Roman Tradition. And then he proves out of *Hierom* his ‘ Epistle to *Evagrius*, and his Commentary on the first to ‘ *Titus*, that the ancient consecration of Bishops, was nothing ‘ else but their election and inthronization by the Elders, who ‘ chose out one of their company for a Bishop, and placed ‘ him in a higher seat then the rest, and called him a Bishop, ‘ withour further Ceremony; just as an Army makes a Ge- ‘ neral, or as if the Deacons should choose one from among ‘ them

a See *Bishop Jewels Reply to Harding Art 4. Divis. 25. Eusebius Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 11. l. 6. c. 29. l. 7. c. 3. Socr. Eccles. Hist. l. 2. c. 6. l. 5 c. 8, 9, 9, 15 l. 7 c. 3. 12, 26, 28, 29, 34, 35, 30. 45. l. 4 c. 6. Evagrius Eccle hist. l. 2 c. 8. 11 l. 3. c. 13, 12 l. 4. c. 6. 26 Gratian. Distinct. 63 79 Appendix ad Catalogum Tist. Veritatis*

'them and call him an Archdeacon, having no other conse-'cration but such as the other Deacons had, being advanced 'above others only by the election of his fellow-brethren, 'without other solemnity.

By which it is plain, that in the primitive Church, Presbyters did not onely ordain Presbyters and Deacons, before there were any Bishops elected and instituted; bnt likewise, that after Bishops were instituted, they elected and ordained Bishops (as well as Elders and Deacons) and that the sole ordination and consecration of Bishops in the Primitive and purest times, was nothing bnt the Presbyters bare election and inthronization of them without more solemnity; So that the other Rites and Ceremonies now used, are but Novelties. '*Anselm Archbishop* of *Canterbury* on the 1 Tim. 4. 14. expounds these words, 'with the lay-'ing on of hands of the Presbytery; in this manner, He calls 'that the laying on of hands which was made in his ordinati-'on; which imposition of hand was in the Presbytery, be-'cause that by this imposition of hands, he received an Elder-'ship, that is, a Bishoprick. For a Bishop is often called a 'Presbyter by the Apostle, and a Presbyter a Bishop. (both which in his *Commentary* on 1 *Tim.* 3. on *Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. '5, 7. he proves to be one and the same in the Apostles time, 'and in the primitive Church. So that by his resolution the imposition of hands, and power of ordaining Elders and Bishops, belongs by divine right to Presbyters as well as to Bishops. Our *English* Apostle (a) *John Wickliff*, and his Coætanean (b) *Richard Fitzralphe*, otherwise called, *Richardus Armachanus Archbishop and Primate of Ardmagh in Ireland*; if we believe either *their own writings*, or (c) *Thomas Walden*, who recites their own opinions, arguments, and takes a great deal of pains (though in vain) to refute them, affirmed and taught:

First, That in the defects of Bishops, any one that was but a mere Priest, was sufficient to administer any Sacrament or Sacramentals whatsoever either found in Scripture, or added since.

Secondly, That one who was but a mere Priest might or-

a *Wickliff*, De 4. Sectis Novellis, c 6 De Pasa c 11

b *Richardus Armachanus* Ad Quæst. Armenorum, l 11 c 1

c *Waldensis* Cont. Wicl. Tom 3. c 60, 61, 63 & Tom. 1 l 2 Artic. 3 c 57

dain another, and that he who was ordained only by a ſimple Prieſt, ought not to doubt of his Presbyterſhip, or to be ordained again, ſo as he rightly performed his Clerical Office, becauſe the Ordination comes from God, who ſupplies all (canonical) defects.

Thirdly, That mere Prieſts may ordain Prieſts, Deacons and Biſhops too; even as the inferiour Prieſts among the Jews did ordain and conſecrate the High Prieſt, as Biſhops conſecrate Archbiſhops, and the Cardinals the Pope.

Fourthly, That the power of Order is equal, and the ſame in Biſhops and Prieſts, and that by their very Ordination they have power given them by Chriſt to adminiſter all Sacraments alike; therefore to confer Orders and confirm Children, which is the leſs, as well as to baptiſe, adminiſter the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and preach the Goſpel, which are the greater.

Fifthly, That Chriſt ſitting in heaven hath given the power of conſecrating and ordaining Prieſts and Deacons, of Confirmation, and all other things, which Biſhops now challenge to themſelves, to juſt Presbyters; and that theſe things were but of late times, even above 300. years after Chriſt, reſerved and appropriated to Biſhops, only by their own Canons and Conſtitutions, to increaſe their *Cæſarian* Pomp and pride. And (*a*) *Waldenſis* himſelf (who undertakes to refute theſe Propoſitions) ſaith expreſly, 'That 'no man hitherto hath denyed, that God in an urgent 'caſe of neceſſity gave the power of ordination to any one 'that is but a mere Prieſt, to wit, in the want or defect of 'Biſhops. All the Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Archdeacons, 'and Clergy of *England* in their book intituled *The Inſti-* 'tution of a Chriſtian man, ſubſcribed with all their hands, 'and dedicated to King *Henry* the 8th. *Anno.* 1537. Chap- 'ter of Orders; and King *Henry* the 8th. himſelf in his 'Book ſtyled, *A neceſſary erudition for any Chriſtian man*, ſet 'out by authority of the Statute of 32. *H.* 8. c. 26. ap- 'proved by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Ne- 'ther houſe or Parliament, prefaced with the Kings own 'Royal Epiſtle, and publiſhed by his ſpecial command in the

a. *Tom.* 3. c 36. *ſect.*

'the year 1543. in the *Chapter of Orders*, expressly resolve, 'That Priests and Bishops by Gods law are one and the same, 'and that the power of Ordination and Excommunication 'belongs eqnally to them both. Learned *Martin Bucer* (a) (*Regius Professor* of Divinity in the University of *Cambridge*, under King *Edward* the sixth, though ordained a Minister only by *Presbyters* in *Germany*, without any REORDINATION IN ENGLAND by our Bishops) in his book *of recalling and bringing into use again the lawful ordination of Ministers, and of the office of Pastors*, in his *Scripta Anglicana*, written here in *England*, p. 254, 255, 259, 291, 292, 293. and on *Matth.* 16. lays down these Conclusions.

(a) See his life, *Antiq. Eccles Brit. in Camero & Baleus cent.* 8. c. 9.

First, That the power of ordination rests principally and originally in Christ himself, the Prince of Pastors.

Secondly, That this power is secondarily and derivatively in the whole Church, whose consent is requisite in the election and ordination of Ministers.

Thirdly, That the actual power of Ordination and imposition of hands belongs as well to Presbyters as to Bishops, that they ought to joyn with the Bishop in the laying on of hands; and that *Timothy* was ordained by the Presbyters.

Fourthly, That Bishops and Ministers have the power of imposition of hands in them only instrumentally, nor originally, as Servants to the whole Congregation.

Fifthly, That the examination and ordination of Ministers ought to be made publickly in the Churches whete they are elected to be Ministers, before all the Congregation; *All which he proves by sundry Scriptures and Histories. Peter Martyr* his Coætanean, (*Regius Professor in the University of Oxford, in the days of king Edward the sixth, though ordained only by Presbyters,*) in his *Commentary upon the* 2 *King* 2. 23. and in his *Common Places*, printed at *London cum privilegio*, *Anno.* 1576. *Class.* 4. *Loc.* 1. *Sect.* 22. *p.* 849. writes thus, 'The 'Papists cannot object grievous sins against the Ministers of 'the Gospel, but they oppose only some slight, that I say 'not ridiculous things: they say that our Pastors have no

imposition of hands, and thence they endeavour to conclude, 'that they are not to be reputed * just Governours of the 'Church; and that the Congregations which are taught 'and governed by them, are no true Churches, but Conven- 'ticles of revolters. And this they say, as if the imposition 'of hands were so necessary, that without it there can be no 'Ministry in the Church; when notwithstanding *Moses* conse- 'crated *Aaron* his brother and his Children, offering divers 'kind of Sacrifices, on which no man formerly had laid on 'hands. Likewise *John* the *Baptist* brought in a new right of 'Baptism, and administred it to the Jews, when as yet no hands 'had been laid upon him, and he himself had been baptized 'of no man. *Paul* also called by Christ in his journey, did 'not presently go to the Apostles that they might lay hands 'upon him, but he taught in *Arabia* three years space, and 'ministred to the Churches, before that he went up to the 'Apostles his Antecessors, as himself witnesseth in *his* 'Epistle to the Galathians. We reject not the imposition 'of hands, but retain it in many Churches; which if we re- 'ceive not from their Bishops, we are not to be blamed for 'it; for they would not confer it on us, unless we would 'depart from sound Doctrin, and likewise bind our selves by 'Oath to the *Roman Antichrist*. In which words he resolves,

* *Our Bishops Ppish position and practise now.*

Nota.

First, That the imposition of hands is no such essential part of Ministers ordination, (a) but that it may be omitted; and that those who are elected and lawfully called to the Ministry by the suffrage of the whole Church and people, are Ministers lawfully called and ordained without this Ceremony.

(a) *See Davidis Blondelli Apologia, sect. 3 De Ordinatione, & Plebis in Electionibus jure, p 309, to 449. where this is largly proved.*

Secondly, That imposition of hands belongs to Ministers, as well as Bishops; and that those who are ordained Ministers in the reformed Churches, where they have no Bishops, only by the laying on of hands of other Ministers, are lawfully ordained.

Thirdly, That this position, that the power of Ordination belongs only to Bishops; that those are no true Ministers who are ordained without a Bishop, and their Churches no true Church, but Conventicles of Schismaticks, is but a vain ridi-

ridiculous Popish Cavil. Our Prelates therefore should be ashamed to ground both their own, and *Titus* his Episcopal Hierachie upon it. The Papists and Jesuites have made use of this erroneous Paradox, on purpose to render the Ordinations of Ministers, by *Luther*, *Zwinglius*, *Calvin*, *Melanchia*, and other first Reformers of the Protestant Churches, and their Successors since their separation from the Church of *Rome*, mere *Nullities*, their *Ministers* no *Ministers*, and by consequence the Protestant Churches and Sacraments no Churches or Sacraments at all; Whence (*a*) *Bellarmine* (b) *Cornelius Jansenius*, and other Papists argue thus: *Lutherus, Zwinglius, Calvinus, Melanthonus*, &c. *non fuerunt a veris Pastoribus Episcopi ordinati, sed Presbyteri tantum. Ergo nec illi qui primis illis succerunt, ab iis ordinati fuerunt veri Pastores. Sed Ecclesia sine Pastoribus esse non potest*; SEQUITUR IGITUR, ADVERSARIOS VERAM ECCLESIAM NON HABERE. Which they stile ARGUMENTUM INDISSOLUBILE. This Popish and Jesuitical position and opinion, though at large refuted by *Peter Martyr*, *Chamier*, *Gersomus Bucerus*, *David Blondellus*, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi*, *De Episcopis & Presbyteris*, *Sectio. 3. Gisbertus Voetius* in his *Desperata Causa Papatus*, *ubi imprimis magna illa præjudicia de Reformatorum Vocatione, successione & secessione funditus subruuntur*, Lib. 2. Sect. 2. with other forein Protestant, and our own Domestick Divines; yet Archbishop (c) *Laud*, in his Relation of his conference with *Fisher*, *p.* 175. 176. is not ashamed to shake hands with the Papists and Jesuites herein, and positively to conclude, *That no mere Priest had the power of Ordination*, BUT A BISHOP ONLY: and thence he infers, NO BISHOP, NO CHURCH: wherein he is seconded by Bishop *Mountague Originum Ecclesiasticarum*, Tom. 1. *pars posterior*, p. 464. By Bishop *Hall*, in his *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, p. 18, 19, 91. and Part 2. Sect. 15. *Power of Ordination* IS ONLY IN BISHOPS. Upon which account Bishop *Hall* re-ordained (d) Mr. *John Dury*, formerly ordained by Presbyters in a reformed Church beyond the Seas; when as all our Bishops admit the Ordination of *Masse-Priests* in the Church of *Rome* it self by *Popish Bishops*,

a De Clericis
b Notarum Spongia Cont. Gul. Voetium

c See *Canterbaries* Doom, p. 389, 390.

d See the Time-serving Proteus.

Bishops, to be a *lawful Ordination*, and never reordained (a) any Popish Priest or Jesuite, if he became a Protestant, but admitted him to exercise his Ministry freely amongst us, without renouncing his *Popish Orders*, *and taking new from them.* In imitation of whose Jesuitical opinion, and Romish practice our present Bishops, and Vicars Generals are now forigidly *Popish* and *extravagant herein*, that they refuse to own any of our Ministers, ordained by *Presbyters*, during the late troubles, to be *Ministers*; and will not admit them to Benefices or Fellowships, unless they *will renounce their Presbyterial Ordination*, as NULL and VOID, and receive a NEW ORDINATION FROM BISHOPS, notwithstanding their promised and expected moderation and reformation of these their former *Exorbitances*, the principal occasion of our late Wars and miseries. I shall therefore seriously beseech and desire our Prelates and their Vicars Generals to be ashamed of, and renounce this their Popish and Jesuitical practice and position; whereby they not only greatly offend, but even Un-church most Protestant Churches in forein parts, and Un-minister their Ministers, amongst whom his Majesty and themselves have been harbored and relieved in their greatest Extremities. Especially seeing *Erastus Junior* (newly published by a (b) *Popish Priest*, under the disguise of a Sectary) doth not onely argue and declaim against all *Presbyterian Ministers* and *their Ordinations*, but even against their own *Episcopal consecrations and ordinations*, as mere NULLITIES, because not derived from the Roman Pontif, nor warranted by those Canons and Councils which they urge against Presbyterial Ordinations. And to reclaim them from their error herein, I shall desire them for their own honour, and our Churches peace, with unpassionate spirits, and dis-engaged affections, seriously to consider that (c) Archbishop *Cramner*, Bishop *Ridly* and your other Protestant Bishops in the beginning of *Reformation* of our Religion in King *Edward* the sixth his Raign, not only by their *Letters* invited *Martin Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Paulus Fagius*, *Immanuel Tremelius*, *Peter Alexander*, *D. Valerandus*, (together with *Philip Melancthon* and *Musculus*, *à patis retrienti*, se

a Mr. *Samuel* Rutherfords due Right of Presbyteries, p. 237, 238, 239, &c.

b *London* 1660.

c *Antiquitates Eccles. Brit. p.* 399. 400. *Balaus Centur.* 8. *c.* 90.

ſe per literas excuſabant) to come over into *England*, to help reform Religion, and Church Government therein, though all ordained Miniſters by *Luther*, and other Presbyters; but likewiſe embraced them, as the moſt eminent Miniſters of the Goſpel, advanced them to the Divinity Chairs in both our *Univerſities*, and other places of preferment in our Church, without preſſing them to any Reordination by *Biſhops*, yea juſtified, and approved their premiſed Books and opinions, touching the *lawfulneſs of Presbyterian Ordination without any Biſhops* concurrence in it. And therefore it ſeems moſt monſtrous in our preſent Prelates to decry and reject ſuch Ordinations now as meer *nullities*; which cannot proceed but either from an *unevangelical*, *malignant*, or *Romiſh Spirit*, Next I ſhall intreat them adviſedly to ponder what our learned Writers and Profeſſors of Divinity have formerly written in this particular. Learned (*a*) Dr. *Whitaker*, writing againſt *Bellarmine*, ſaith, *That this Text of the* 1 Tim. 4 14. *makes very much againſt the adverſaries; For from this place we underſtand, that* Timothy *received impoſition of hands from the Elders, who at that time governed the Church by a common Council*; *And againſt* (b) *Duræus*, he argues thus, *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Bucer*, *and others*, *were Presbyters*; *and Presbyters by Gods Law are the ſame with Biſhops*; *therefore they might lawfully ordain other Presbyters*. Dr. *Fulk in his Confutation of the Rhemiſh Teſtament*: *Annot. on* Tit. 1. *ſect.* 2. and Dr. *Willet in his Synopſis Papiſmi*, *the* 5. *general Controverſie*, *queſt.* 3. *part* 2. write thus, 'Although in the 'Scripture a Biſhop and an Elder is of one order and authority in preaching the Word, &c. yet in Government, by ancient uſe of ſpeech, he is onely called a Biſhop, which is in 'the Scripture called chiefin government, to whom the ordination or conſecration by impoſition of hands was always 'principally committed. Not that impoſition of hands, belongeth onely to him; for the reſt of the Elders that were 'preſent at Ordination did lay on their hands, or elſe the 'Biſhop did lay on his hands in the name of the reſt. We 'differ from the Papiſts in this; They affirm, that not 'principally and chiefly, but ſolely and wholly the right of

Nota.

(a) Controv. 2. qu. 5. c. 5.

(b) Contra Duræum l. 9. §. 55

'consecrating and giving Orders appertaineth unto Bishops. 'But concerning the power of giving Orders we say; that 'though it were chiefly in the Apostles, yet the Pastors and 'Elders together with them laid on their hands, *Acts* 13. 3, '4. and as S. *Paul* speaketh of his laying on of hands, 2 *Tim.* '1. 6. so he maketh mention of imposition of hands by the 'Eldership, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. And the *Rhemists* on that place 'mislike not the practice of their Church, that their Priests 'do lay on their hands together with the Bishop upon his 'head that is to be ordained. What else doth this signifie, 'but that they have some interest in ordaining together 'with the Bishop? The 4th Council of *Carthage*, *can.* 3. de-crees thus, 'Let all the Priests that are present, hold their 'hands next to the Bishops hand, upon the head of him 'that is to be ordained. Again, *can.* 14. of the same Coun-cil: 'The Bishop must not give orders, but in the presence 'and assembly of the Clergy. By this then it is manifest, 'that imposition of hands doth not wholly and solely belong 'to the Bishop, seeing the rest of the Elders were wont to 'lay on their hands likewise, or the Bishop in the name of 'the rest. So that the Elders were not excluded. Dr. *Field in his 5th Book of the Church*, c. 27. is of the same opinion; where he proves out of *Durandus and other Papists*, 'That 'the power of consecration and order is not greater in Bi-'shops then in any other Ministers; that the power of or-'dination was reserved to Bishops, not by any Divine, but *Nota.* 'humane Constitutions onely, rather for to honour the Bi-'shops Priestly place, then for that it might not be done by 'any other, and for the avoiding of confusion and schism in 'the Church: Concluding, that in cases of necessity; as 'when Bishops are extinguished by death; or fallen into 'Heresie, or obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the 'Word and Gospel of Christ sincerely, and the like, then 'Ministers onely may ordain other Ministers, without any 'Bishops assistance. And Mr. *Cartwright* in his *Confutation of the Rhemish Testament*, on the 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *sect.* 18. and on *Tit.* 1. *sect.* 2. proves, 'both by the *Rhemists* own pra-'ctice and confession, by the 4th Council of *Carthage*, cited

'by them, and the History of *Eradius* his Ordination, who 'succeeded *Augustine*, to which six Elders as well as two 'Bishops were called, and by the Text of *Timothy* it self, 'that the imposition of hands belongs to Elders as well as 'Bishops, which he manifests to be one and the same by di-'vine institution. 'Finally, acute and learned Dr. *Ames in his Bellarminus Enervatus, Tom.* 2. *l.* 3. c. 2. of the *vocation and ordination of Ministers*, sect. 4. *&c. De Ordinatione*, concludes thus against *Bellarmine*, who affirms, *that the ordination, vocation, and election of Bishops and other Ministers of the Church belongeth onely to Bishops.*

First, That it cannot belong *Jure Divino* to Popish Bishops, superior to Presbyters in degree, because they themselves are onely *vel juris, vel injuriæ humanæ*, of humane right, or rather injury, not of divine institution.

Secondly, That the very act of ordination belongs to divine Bishops, that is, to Presbyters, in a Church well ordered.

Thirdly, That as to the right, force and vertue which it hath in constituting the Ministers of the Church, it always appertains to the whole Church; as the celebration of Matrimony receives all its force and vertue from the consent of the parties married.

Fourthly, That in the corrupted and collapsed state of the Church, the Ministery and Order failing; the very Act of Ordination, so far forth as it is necessary to the constitution of a Minister, may in such case be lawfully executed by the people.

Fifthly, That the Act of Ordination is attributed to Presbyters, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. And that the Apostles themselves did not ordain ordinary Ministers, but by the concurrence and consent of the people, *Acts* 14. 23.

Sixthly, That in the primitive Church, which was governed by the Common Counsel of the Presbyters, before there were any Bishops, the very first Bishops were not ordained by Bishops, which then were not, but by Ministes and Presbyters onely.

Seventhly, That all the Councils, Decrees and Testimonies of Fathers objected to the contrary, prove nothing

else, but that the Act and Right of Ordination partly by Custom, and partly by humane Decrees, was given to the chief Presbyter or Bishop after the Apostles time, but not belonging to them by any Divine Right.

Eighthly, That the imposition of hands is not absolutely necessary to the essence of a Pastor, no more then a Coronation to the essence of a King, or the celebration of a Mariage, to the essence of a marriage.

Ninthly, That the power of Ordination, according to the Schoolmen and Canonists, is not an act of Jurisdiction, but of simple Office, which Presbyters may perform without any Command or Jurisdiction.

Tenthly, That the Papists themselves teach, that Baptism conferred by any Christian, though a lay-man or woman, is good, by reason of the necessity of it: That a simple Presbyter by the common consent of the Popish Doctors, may administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, or confer any of the greater Orders; and that all the Pontificians teach with unanimous consent, that a Bishop once consecrated, although he be a Simoniack, Heretick, excommunicate Person, or the like, may yet firmly ordain others. Therefore a *fortiori* godly Presbyters, or the People and Church of Christ, may lawfully confer Orders without the help or concurrence of a Bishop. Which Authority of his ought not to be slighted as Scismatical or Erroneous, it being consonant to the Doctrine both of our own and other Writers, Churches; *and this Book of his printed by Authority, in the University of Oxford*, no longer since then *Anno* 1629. It is evident then by this whole cloud of Witnesses (to omit others) that the power and right of Ordination and imposition of hands (which, saith (a) *Gratian, is nothing else but a Prayer over a man; and as* (b) *Aquinas writes; signifieth onely the conferring of grace, which is given by Christ; and not that Ministers* (he saith not Bishops, who are here but Ministers) *give this grace; and so as proper for Ministers as Bishops both by Divine and Humane right and practise*; belongs to Presbyters and ordinary Ministers as well as Bishops; therefore Bishops cannot be paramount Presbyters and ordinary Ministers

a *Manuum impositio quid est aliud quàm oratio super hominem* 1 Caus. q. 1 c. *Manus Ambr. in* 1 Tim. 4.

b *In* 1 Tim. 4. Lect. 3. *see* Gersomus Eucerus De Gubern. Eccl. p. 337

nisters in order and Jurisdiction, in this regard; neither will this power of Ordination prove *Timothy* or *Titus Diocæsan* Bishops as they now vainly surmise. Wherefore I shall retort the Objection in this manner against the opposites.

That power or authority which is common by divine right and institution to Evangelical Ministers and Presbyters as well as to Bishops, can neither prove *Timothy* or *Titus* to be Bishops, or Bishops to be superior to Presbyters or Ministers in Jurisdiction, order, dignity or degree, *Jure divino* or *humano*.

But the power and Authority of ordaining Presbyters, Ministers, and Deacons, is such; as the premises undeniably evidence.

Therefore it can neither prove *Timothy* or *Titus* to be Bishops, nor Bishops to be superiour to Presbyters, or Ministers in Jurisdiction, order, dignity or degree, *Jure divino* or *humano*.

Sixthly, St. *Paul* in the 1 *Tim.* 3. and *Titus* 1.6. *&c. makes a particular enumeration and recital both of the qualifications, and offices of a Bishop*; But among all these, he speaks not a word concerning the power or act of ordination; neither doth he make it a part of a Bishops qualification or duty to be apt and able discreetly to confer orders, as he doth particularly require, *he* (a) *should be apt to teach*: How therefore this should be a chief property, or principal sole quality of a Bishop, I cannot yet conjecture, since the Scripture makes it none, but rather a *property and act of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. 4.14. Act. 13.3,4. I shall desire Bishops therefore, to produce some Divine Charter or other for this their pretended Monopolie of ordination, which they would ingross unto themselves alone (perchance to make the more advantage by it, it (b) *being a sweet and pleasant gain as some handle it now*,) before they lay any further Title thereunto, even as they are Diocesan Bishops.

Seventhly, I must inform our Bishops for their learning, that (c) *An.* 31. *H.* 8. *in the Patent Rolls part* 4. *King Henry the*

a 1 *Tim.* 3. 2.

b *Lindewoods cænstit. Provinc l.* 3. *de consibus cap. Seu a. f.* 60. 161.

c *See my Breviate of the Prelates intollerable Incroachments upon the Kings Prerogative Royal, and Subjects Liberties.*

the 8. granted a Patent to all the Archbishops, and Bishops of England, to enable them to consecrate Churches, Chapels, and Churchyards, by vertue of his special Patents and Commissions under his great Seal first obtained; without which they could not do it: and that all the Bishops in Ed. 6. time, ordain and conhad special clauses in their Letters Patents, authorizing them to stitute Ministers and Deacons, as Bishop Ponets, Bishop Scorves, Bp. Coverdales, Patents 5 Edw. 6. pars 1, &c. with others in his reign, testifie at large. Neither do or can our Archbishops or Bishops consecrate any Bishop, unless they have the Kings own (a) Letters Patents, authorizing and commanding them to do it, as the Patents directed to them upon every Bishops consecration and experience witnesseth. It is clear therefore that their power to consecrate Churches, Chapels, Churchyards, Ministers and Bishops, belongs not to them as they are Bishops, and that it is merely humane not Divine, since they claim and execute it (b) only by virtue of the Kings Letters Patents; and as a part of their Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (not Ministerial function) derived only from the King, as the Statutes of 26 H. 8. c. 1. 37. H. 8. c. 17. 1 E. 6. c. 2. 5 E. 6. c. 1. 1 Eliz. c. 1, 2, 5 Eliz. c. 1. 8 Eliz. c. 1. resolve: Therefore it cannot advance them above Presbyters, by any divine right.

Eightly, (c) All accord, 'that in cases of necessity, when 'or where Bishops are wanting, or when there are none but 'Simoniacal or Heretical Bishops, who refuse to ordain such 'as are Orthodox, or will not subscribe to their heresies, 'there Presbyters and ordinary Ministers may lawfully con-'fer Orders, confirm, and do other Acts, which Bishops 'usually ingross to themselves; so Ambrose, Augustine, Richardus Armachanus, Wickliffe, Thomas Waldensis, Field, Ames, *with others in their forequoted places; and generally all Divines resolve without dispute.* Yea that learned Morney Lord of Plessis, in his book De Ecclesia, c. 11. '(d) Amesius, *with sundry others affirm*, that the people 'alone in case of necessity where there are no Bishops nor Mi-'nisters, may lawfully elect and ordain Ministers, as well as 'baptise and preach (*both which* (e) Papists, and (f) Prote-'stants affirm, that Laymen may lawfully do in case of necessity) the

a See Wests presidents Warranti Sect. 74.
b See Erastus Junior
c Mr. Perkins on Gal. 1. 8. Zanchius Com. in Eph. 5. Mr. Rutherford his due right of Presbyteries, c. 8 Sect. 8. p. 175, to 240 Robinson and others there quoted. Bishop Downham his Sermon on 1 Pet. 1, 6.
d Bellarminus Enec. Tom. 2. l. 3 c. 2
e Summa Angelica, Baptismus 5 Sect. 12. Conc. Carth. 4 Can. 39, 99. Grat an Distinct 23, cap. Muliar.
f Fox Acts and Monuments, 16. o. p. 465 485, 501, 599 1015, 1016, 1795, 1796.

'the right of ordination and election of Ministers being ori-
'ginally in the whole Church and People, Ministerially only
'in Bishops and Ministers as servants to the Congregation, and
'the imposition of hands no essential, but a ceremonial part
'of ordination, which may be sufficiently made without
'it, as *Angelu. de Clavasio*, *Peter Martyr*, and others, both Papists and Protestants, affirm. But when *Paul left Titus in Crete*, (e) *to set in order the things that were wanting, and to ordain Elders in every City*, there were present no other Bishops or Elders to ordain Ministers, (as is likely) but *Titus* onely and the people; for we read of none else but *Titus* then in *Crete* (which was but newly converted to the faith;) and he is injoyned, *to ordain Elders in every City*; which proves there were none there before, for what need then of any, yea of *many* others to be newly ordained, and that *in every City*? *Titus* his example of ordination therefore in this exigent and neccesity in a Church then newly planted, is no argument to prove him a Diocæsan Bishop; since other ordinary *Ministers* might ordain in such a case, as (f) all acknowledg, *yea and the people too, without either Minister or Bishop to assist them.*

e Tit. 1. 5. Cyprian Epist. 68.

f Saravia de diversis Ministrorum gradibus c 2 p. 32. Davinis Blondelli Apolog Sect. 3. p 354.

Ninthly, I answer, that it is most evident, that *Titus* did not ordain Elders in every City, by vertue of any Episcopal inherent Jurisdiction of his own, but as *Pauls* Substitute, who *appointed him to do it, and prescribed him what manner of Persons he should ordain*: Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. This therefore cannot prove *Titus* to be a Bishop; or that the sole right of ordination is appropriated unto Bishops, as Bishops, but rather the contrary.

Lastly, Admit, that the power of ordaining Presbyters belonged onely to Bishops *Jure Divino*; yet is no good consequent: *Ergo*, they are superior to Presbyters in order and degree *Jure divino*; since the conferring of orders, (an (g) *act of service, of Ministry only, not of authority, and no more then an external complement or Ceremony*) *is far* (h) *inferior to the authority of preaching, baptising, consecrating, and administring the Sacrament of the Lords supper, binding obstinate, and loosing penitent sinners, which Jure Divino every Minister*

g Amesius Bellarminus Enervatus Tom, 2. l. 3. c. 1. and others forequoted.

h See Gersomius Bucerus de Gubern Eccles. p. 33, 158, to 162, 261, 262, 493, 500, 547.

h 1 Cor. 12. 9, 10. Act. 10. 46

i Marsilius Patavinus Defens. Pacis pars 2. c. 20, 24. Fox. Acts and Monuments. p. 1153. Bishop Latymers 4th. Ser. of the plough. Nicholaus de Clemangis de corrupto Eccl. statu. c. 14, 15, 16 Avent. Annal. Bojorum l. 6. Proemio.

k De clericis c. 4.

l Sessio 24. Decr. de Reformatione cap. 4.

m Thom. Becons Catechisme. The Institution of a Christian man: Chapter of Orders. Gersomus Bucerus de Gubern. Eccl. p. 33, 138, usque 162, 261, 262, 499, 500, 517, 518, 540, 622, 623.

n Hobards Reports, p. 107, 150, &c. See Godwins Catalogue of Bishops, p. 70, 72, 114, 123, 143, 144, 185, 214, 220, 247, 246, 275, 345, 382, 422, 436, 448, 484, 501, 502, 568, 610, 470, 571. 572, 610, 621, 622, 630.

o Godwins Catalogue of Bishops, p. 641, 657, 660. Brook County Palatine, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 24.

may do as well as a Bishop. The Bishops and Ministers in the primitive Church had (h) *many of them the gift of Tongues, of prophecy, of healing and working miracles*, which some Bishops then, and all now want; yet these extraordinary endowments made them not superior in Jurisdiction, order or degree to those Bishops who then wanted those gift, or to ours now who take far more state upon them, than those Bishops did. (i) *Many Bishops there are and have been that could not, at least would not preach*, though (k) *Bellarmine himself*, yea the (l) *Council of Trent*, and (m) *all men acknowledg, that it is the chiefest, and most honorable part of their Episcopal function, as making them Christs Ambassadors*: Are they then inferior in order, dignity, power degree to Bishops, yea to Ministers, Vicars, and poor Curates who are both able and willing to preach? That which makes any man superior in order, Jurisdiction, or dignity to his equal, must be an authority superior to that which his equal hath, not the accession of any inferior dignity or power. The making of an Earl, a Knight, or Country Justice, adds nothing to his former honour in point of superiority or precedency: if a Bishop be presented to an ordinary benefice, Prebendary or Deanery, (*as* (n) *some are and have been by way of Commendam.*) it accumulates nought to his Episcopal authority. Therefore the power of ordination being inferiour to the power of the Keys, preaching and administring the Sacrament, (which every Minister enjoys *Jure divino*, as absolutely as any Archbishop or Bishop) can no ways advance Bishops in Jurisdiction or degrees above Presbyters and ordinary Ministers, no more then the Bishop of *Durham his being a* (o) *Count Palatine, with his large temporal Jurisdiction, far exceeding that of all our Archbishops and Bishops*, advanceth him in order and degree above them all. So that this grand Objection to prove *Titus* a Bishop; yea a Bishop superior in Jurisdiction, order, and degree to Ministers, is both false and idle.

Obj. 4. If any object, *That it is a received Maxime in the Schools,* * *that he which ordains is greater then he who is ordained*; and that the Apostle saith, Heb. 7. 7. *That the lesser is blessed of the greater*; Therefore *Titus*, and so likewise Bishops who ordaine Ministers, are superior to Ministers, in point of Jurisdiction, order, dignity and degree.

Answ. 1. I answer, *First*, that this objection takes that for granted which I formerly refuted, and evidenced to be a falsehood; to wit, That the power of ordination belongs only to Bishops, not to Presbyters: and so is built on a false sandy foundation.

Secondly, I answer, that this proposition, he that ordaineth or consecrateth Ministers is greater in Jurisdiction, power, or degree, than the parties consecrated and ordained; is a notorious dotage and untruth, broached at first by (a) *Epiphanius* to confute *Aerius his orthodox opinion of the parity of Bishops and Presbyters*; and since that taken up at second hand by (b) *Bellarmine and other Jesuites*, the (c) *Council of Trent*, (d) *Bishop Downham* with other Patriots of the Popes and Prelates Monarchy; and last of all (like Coleworts twice sodd) usurped by all *our Prelates in their High Commission at Lambeth in their censure of Doctor Bastwick*, who laid the whole weight and burthen of their Episcopal superiority and precedency over other Ministers, upon this rotten counterfeited Pillar, unable any ways to support it, as these ensuing demonstrations I will evidence at large beyond all contradiction.

For first of all we know, (e) that *Cardinals and Bishops at this day, (as the people and Clergy, yea the Emperours heretofore) do elect and consecrate the Pope*; yet they are not greater in order, dignity, power or Jurisdiction than the Pope, but inferiour, and he far superior to them in all these. We (f) read, that *Metropolitans, Patriarks, Primates and Archbishops are created, consecrated and installed by ordinary Bishops, as the* (g) *Archbishops of Canterbury and York, have often times heretofore and of late been consecrated by the Bishops of London, Rochester, Winchester, Salisbury, Bangor, and the like*: yet are they not greater in dignity, power, authority, place, or order

* Bellarmin. de Cleric. l. 3. Quest. 2.

a Contra haereses, l 3 Tom 1 Her 75. Col. 75[illegible], 76[illegible].

b De Clericis, l 3. Quest. 2.

c Sessio 23. De Sacramento Ordinis, cap 3. & Canon 7.

d His Sermon, April 17. Anno 1608. in the defence of the honorable Function of Bishops, and his defence of that Sermon since Bishop Bilson of the perpetual Government of the Church, c. 13.

e Gratian Distinct. 79. 63.

f Pontificale Romanum, Platina invitis Pontif.

g Gratian Distinct 79, 63.

g See Antiquitatis Ecclesiae Brit Godwins Catalogue of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. Malmesb. de Gest. Pontifi. Angl. with Masonis Consecra. of Bos. and the book of consecra. of Bishops.

order then they, but subordinate and subject to them whom they thus ordain, in every of these. We know by daily experience, that one Bishop consecrates and ordains another, and he a second, and that second a third; yet all of them are of equal power, and Jurisdiction, not different or distinct in order or degree; and sometimes the last of the three in respect of his Bishoprick, takes *precedency of the rest, that ordained him, as the* (h) *Bishop of London, Durham, and Winchester do here with us, and other* Bishops do the like in foreign parts. So *Some* (i) *Ministers joyn with the Bishop in the ordination and laying on of hands on other Ministers,* yet none of them is deemed superior in Jurisdiction, order, or degree to the other. Now were this our Prelates objected paradox true; the Cardinals should be greater in order, power and degree, than the Popes; the Bishops, than the Patriarks, Metropolitans, Primates and Archbishops ordained or consecrated by them; one Bishop, one Minister greater then another; yea there should be so many different degrees among Bishops and Ministers, as there are successive subordinate ordinations; which is both false and absurd. S. *Hierom* (k) *in his Epistle to Evagrius and on Titus* 1. with *Alcuvinus, De Divinis officiis* c. 37. affirm, *that in the Primitive Church Bishops were at the first both elected and consecrated by the Presbyters; and the Scripture is express, that both Paul and Timothy were ordained by the Presbytery,* Acts 13. 3, 4. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. If the Bishops reason then be Orthodox; it follows inevitably, That in the Apostles times, and the Primitive Church, Presbyters were superior in jurisdiction, order and degree to Bishops, yea to *Paul* and *Timothy*, the one an Apostle, the other an Evangelist, being all ordained by Presbyters; not Bishops Lords paramount over them, as they now pretend; and then farewel their divine Hierachy which they so much contend for. The *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* (who stood much upon this argument at *Doctor Bastwicks* Censure) both *crowned our Soveraign Lord King Charls*, and *baptised* his Son *Prince Charls*; will he therefore conclude, that he is greater in power, authority, place and Jurisdiction than they? The (l) *Archbishops of Canterbury, have usuallly crowned*

31 H 8. c 10.

Cassanaeus catal Glori mundi pars 4. *Sect.* 8, *to* 50.

i *The book of Ordination of Ministers: & Can.* 35.

k *See Davidis Blondelli Apol. sect. de ordinatione.*

l *See Liber Regalis, Antiquitates Eccles. Brit & Goodwins Catalogue of Bishops. Bochellus Decret. Eccles Gal* 1 *l* 5. *Tit.* 2.

and

and Baptised the Kings of England, and the Archbishops of Rhemes the Kings of France; will they therefore infer: Ergo they are greater in power, dignity, and authority then they; as the (a) *Popes argue, that they are greater then the Emperors, because the Bishops of Rome have usually crowned the Emperors?* Are the Princes electors in *Germany* greater then the Emperors; or Nobles of *Poland, Bohemia*, and *Sweden* greater than their Kings; because they (b) elect and create them Emperors and Kings? Are the Lord Majors of *London* and *York*, or the Majors of other Cities inferiour to the Commons; or the Lord Chancellors of our Universities of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, less honorable, potent then, and inferiour to the Doctors, Proctors, and Masters of Art? or the heads or Masters of the Colledges and Halls in them, subordinate to, or less worshipful or eminent than the fellows, because they are elected, constituted and created by them, to be such? Are the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses of the Parliament, not so good as those Freeholders, Citizens and Burgesses who elect them? Or the Masters of Companies inferior to those that choose them? If not, as all must grant, how is this maxime true, *That he who constitutes, ordains, or consecrates another, is greater then the parties constituted, ordained, or consecrated, and that in Jurisdiction, place, order, and degree?* Our *Popish Priests* are not ashamed to proclaim, (c) *That in their consecration of the Sacrament, they create their very Creator, and make no less then Christ himself*: are they therefore greater and higher in order and degree then Christ, the (d) *great and only high Priest*, the (e) *Shepheard, and Bishop of our Souls*, whose *Vicar and Substitute the Pope himself doth but claim to be?* Certainly if this their Popish Proposition be true, they must needs be one order or degree Higher, in point of Priesthood, than Christ himself; who must then loose his Titles of *High Priest*, and *Chief Shepheard*, because every Masse-Priest will be paramount him, in that he not only consecrates, *but creates him too*. We read in (f) *Scripture, that Kings, Priests and Prophets were usually annointed and consecrated to be such with oyl*; was therefore the oyl that consecrated them, greater or better than they

a *Marsilius Patavinus Defensoris Pacis p. 2. c. 15. Barth. Cassaneus catal. Gloriæ mundi pars 4. consid. 7.*

b *See Munsters Cosmography Grimstons imperial History.*

c *Disc. Serm. 111. Bishop Iewels Reply to Harding. Artic. 12. Divis 10. p. 452, 453.*

d *Heb 4. 14, 15, & 8. 1. & 9. 11. & 10. 21.*

e *Heb 13. 10. 1 Pet 2. 25. & 5. 4. Iohn 10. 1. &c.*

d *Concil. Constantien. Sessio 14. Bellarm. De Pontifice Romano.*

f *Exod. 29. & 35. Lev 4. 3. 16. 1 Sam. 10. 1. & 16. 6. 11. Psal. 52. 10. 1 Kings 1. 39. & 19. 15, 16.*

they? Are the Font and Water, better then the Children baptized in, or with them? The Diadems better then the Kings, because they Crown them? or the very hands of Bishops and Ministers, worthier then Ministers ordained by them? If not, then are not Bishops greater then the Ministers which they ordain or consecrate, since they are but instruments, servants, not prime original Agents, Lords, or Supreme absolute Actors in these several consecrations and actions. If we cast our eyes either upon nature or policy, we finde this Proposition of our Prelates a meer falshood. In Nature we see, that a Man begets a Man, an Horse an Horse, an Ass an Ass, a Dog a Dog, &c. equal one to the other in Nature, Quality, Species, and Degree; the Son being as much a Man, a Gentleman as the Father; the Colt as much an Horse as the Steed that begot him. In Civil or Politique Constitutions, we see the like; in our Universities, Doctors, and Professors of Divinity, Physick, Law, Musick, create other Doctors of the same Professions, equal to themselves, and as much Doctors in these Arts as they; one Doctor in each of these, being as much and no more a Doctor then another, save onely in point of time or antiquity, but not in respect of the profession or degree of Doctorship it self; yea, (a) *every Minister made by any Bishop, is as much, as truly and fully a Minister as the Bishop himself, as all Protestants and Papists do acknowledge*; therefore the same in specie with, and equal to a Bishop: Our Bishops pretend themselves *Spiritual Fathers*, and they call the Ministers ordained by them, *Sons*: So (b) *Epiphanius long since argued against Aerius*: As therefore in Natural generations, a man begets a man, a beast a beast; and in civil respects, a Gentleman begets a Gentleman; a Peasant, a Peasant, &c. but not a man a beast, a beast a man, a Gentleman a Peasant, nor a Peasant a Gentleman; So Bishops when they engender natural Children, beget them as men, not Bishops, and their Children are as much men as themselves; when they spiritually ordain or engender Ministers, they do it onely as they are Ministers, not Bishops, and those they thus beget and ordain, are as much Ministers as themselves; when they beget and consecrate *Dio-*

cæsan

a Bishop Jewels Reply to Harding, Article 4. Divis 5,6,18. Richardus Armachanus De Quæst Armeniorum, l. 1, c. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7.

b Contr. hæres. 75

cæsan Bishops, they do it as they are Bishops, and those thus begot and consecrated are as much Bishops as themselves. Since therefore they ordain Ministers onely as they are Ministers, not as bishops, as is clear (else it were an unnatural an incongruous, yea, a monstrous generation, to beget one of a different kinde, order, quality and degree from themselves, and as much as if a man should beget a beast, an Horse, or an Ass) and since every Minister is as much, as compleat a Minister every way as the Bishop, and Ministers who ordain him; how this proposition can be true, *that the Ordainer is higher in jurisdiction then, or different* Jure Divino *in order or degree from the ordained*, I cannot yet perceive, neither can our Prelates ever make it good. We know there are now divers Ministers living, who not onely baptized, but likewise ordained some of our Bishops to be Ministers, and laid hands upon them with the Bishop at the time of their ordination; yea, every of our Bishops and Archbishops were first ordained Ministers by Ministers, before they were made Bishops or Archbishops. And *the first Bishops that were ordained in the Church paramount Minister, were ordained Bishops by Ministers, as* Jerome *writes in his Epistle to* Evagrius, *and* (a) *all since acknowledge out of him.* Are these Ministers therefore in point of order, honour, jurisdiction, dignity and degree, greater then our Archbishops, or Bishops? If so, then the controversie is at an end; and the truth most apparent; that our Ministers are greater and higher in degree then our Bishops and Archbishops, not our Bishops and Archbishops higher, greater then they, as they vainly contend. If not, then the Prelates maxime, on which they ground their Hierarchy, is most false, in that sense in which they urge it, and so will yield no supportation to their Hierarchy.

(a) See Davidis Blondelli apologia, sect. 3.

Thirdly, I answer, That this Proposition of theirs is warranted by no Scripture, nor backed with any convincing reason drawn from Scripture; therefore it proves nothing either for *Titus* his Episcopal Authority; or for Bishops Superiority above other Ministers, by any Divine right or institution: As for that Text of *Heb.* 7. 7.

(*And*

(*And without all contradiction the lesser is blessed of the greater*;) whereon they ground their Paradox, it is nothing to the purpose.

First, Because it is not spoken concerning Ordination, or of one Ministers ordaining or blessing another, but *onely of Melchizedechs blessing of Abraham*, and Ministers blessing of the people, as the words and all (*a*) *Commentators joyntly testifie*.

a *Anselmus Haymo, Rabanus, Primasius, Calvin, Deering David Dickson*, and others on this text.

Secondly, Because it is not meant of Ministers, who bless others onely *Ministerially* or *Instrumentlaly*, by way of duty and service, as Bishops ordain Ministers; not by inherent original Authority: for then Ministers, and other Saints of God, should be better and greater then God, whom they *bless* and *praise*, *Gen.* 9. 26. c. 14. 20. c. 24. 27. *Psal.* 41. 13. *Psal.* 66. 8. *Psal.* 68. 26. *Psal.* 103. 1, 2, 20, 22. *Psal.* 135. 19, 20. *Luke* 1. 68. c. 2. 28. *James* 3. 9. Then *Jacob* who *blessed King Pharaoh*, Gen. 47. 7, 10. should be greater then *Pharaoh* in his own Realm. *The people who blessed King Solomon*, 1 *Kings* 8. 66. greater then their King; and the Disciples and People *who blessed our Saviour Christ*, *Luke* 19. 37, 38. greater then Christ: But this Text is meant of Christ himself; who by *Melchizedech* his type, blessed *Abraham* by his own inherent authority and power; are the only (b) *true High-Priest*, *and* (c) *chief Shepherd of our souls*. If therefore our Prelates take their maxime in this sense, he that ordains Ministers, to wit, originally by his own inherent primitive authority and power, is greater then those who are ordained in jurisdiction, power and degree; then the proposition thus interpreted, is true and warranted by this Text; but yet they gain no advantage by it, because no Bishops, do or can ordain Ministers thus, *but* (d) *onely God and Christ alone*, *whose* Ministers and Servants both the Ordainers and ordained are. But if they mean, that they who ordain Ministers onely Instrumentally and *Ministerially* as *servants* to Christ, his Church, and the whole Congregation (in whom the original and primitive right of Ordination is onely invested) are greater in jurisdiction, order and degree, then those who are ordained, as they do and must do; then the proposition

b Heb. 4. 14, 15. c. 8. 1. c. 3. 1. c. 10. 21

c Heb. 13. 20 1 Pet. 5. 4.

d Eph. 1. 10. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Mat. 9. 37, 38. 2 *Cor.* 4. 5. 1 *Cor.* 3. 5 21, 22 c. 9. 19 *Acts* 13. 1, 2 to 6

position is most false, and not justified by this Scripture, as the premised instances manifest. The King, the original of all Temporal Honour, Justice, Power, is greater then any Officers, Justices, Powers, derived from and under him; but not his Attorney who draws their Patent, or Commissions, nor those who swear or install them in their Dignities and offices, under the King, as Bishops do Ministers under Christ and the Church.

Fourthly, Admit this proposition true; that those who are to ordain others, are greater in power and authority then the parties to be ordained, before their ordination fully executed, because they have an Office, Calling, Ministry which the others want; in which sence the proposition may be true: yet it is not true, that the ordainers are greater in power, office, authority then the parties actually ordained after the ordination past and finished; because the very end of ordination, is to confer the self-same office of Ministry on the parties ordained, which the ordainers themselves have, in as large and ample manner as they enjoy it; and the parties once ordained, are thereby made as compleat, as absolute Ministers every way, in respect of their orders and office, as any of those who ordained them: though they were not so when they came to be ordained. This appears by the examples of * *Mathias* and *Paul*; before they were called and ordained to be Apostles, they were inferiour to other Apostles; but being once called and ordained Apostles, *they became equal with the other Apostles in Apostolical power, dignity, degree*, and *were not inferiour to them in either*. So that from all these premises I may conclude, that this maxime of our Prelates, whereon they build their Episcopal Hierachie, in that sence they take it, is most false; and neither proves *Titus* to be a Diocæsan Bishop, nor yet Bishops to be superior to other Ministers in dignity, power, order or degree, by divine right and institution, as they pretend they are.

* *Act* 1. 25, 26. *Gal* 2. 8, 9, 11, 14 1 *Cor* 12. 28 2 *Cor* 11. 5.

Finally, Admit the proposition true, yet it proves but this, that Bishops are superior to those Ministers onely which themselves actually ordain, so that if they ordain none

they

they are superiour to none;) not to those ordained by other Bishops and Ministers, which may be their equals notwithstanding this allegation, seeing they were not ordained by them; this proposition extending only to the act, not to the power of ordination. If any extend it further, in this sort, that they who have power to ordain Ministers are greater in order, jurisdiction, degree and dignity, then those who want this power; then it will follow, that Bishops suspended from ordaining others (*either for schism, heresie, advancing unworthy Ministers, without due examination, or making Ministers without a title, as many now do,* for which our own (a) *Canons prescribe, they shall be suspened from giving Orders for two years space*) are inferiour in order and degree to Bishops, who may execute this power and ordain; and so one Bishop shall be superiour in order and degree to another Bishop; which none ever yet affirmed; yea, all our Bishops *being prohibited and disabled by their own* (b) *Canons to ordain Ministers and Deacons at any time, but only at the four solemn times appointed, and that in the presence of the Dean, Archdeacon, or two Prebends at the least, or of four other grave Persons, being Masters of Art at least, and allowed for publike Preachers, and in their own Dioces onely, not out of it,* as many *ancient Canonists* resolve. It will hereupon follow, that Bishops onely at these four times of the year, and within their own Dioceses onely, are greater in dignity and degree then Ministers, because they may then and there ordain, but not at other seasons, nor out of their own Dioceses when and where they have no power or authority to confer orders upon any, being restrained by the Canons as well as Ministers. All which being laid together, discovers the weakness, the absurdity of this our Prelates Theory, on which they build both their own, and *Titus* his Hierarchy, which now fall quite to ruine with this their sandy foundation, which I have here for ever dissipated and subverted, if I mistake not.

I shall close up this, concerning the power and right of Ordination, with these ensuing Authorities and memorable examples.

* *Concilium Roman.* Simeon. Dunelmenses, *Hist. col.* 248, 253. *Spelman. Concil p.* 263, 267. *Surius concil. Tom.* 2 *p* 286, 295. *Tom.* 3. *p.* 283

a Canons An. *can.* 33. 1603

b Canon 31 Which they now violate every day by clandestine ordinations in their chambers, and at other seasons.

* *Surius concil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 379, 519, 529, 718. *Tom.* 2 *p* 359, 651. *Tom.* 3. *f.* 282. *Gratian. Distinct.* 71 *Summa Angelica & Rosella ca. Tit. Ordo & Ordinatio.*

examples. (a) *Joannes Major*, (b) *Joannes Fordonus*, (c) *Hector Boetius*, (d) *David Blondellus*, and others record, That the Scots from their first embracing of the Christian Faith, *Anno Christi* 79. till the year 430. when the Pope made and sent *Palladius* to them, to be their first *Bishop*, were constantly instructed and governnd ONELY BY PRESBYTERS AND MONKS, *SINE EPISCOPIS*, WITHOUT BISHOPS, *Qui quod vacarent sedulo prædicationi, essentque frequentes in oratione ab incolis* Culdei, *id est* Cultores Dei *sunt appellati*. So as the primitive Church of *Scotland* for 233. years space, was instructed and governed onely by Presbyters and Monks, who ordained each other Ministers without any Bishops. After this (e) *Columbanus* a Presbyter and Abbot by profession, coming out of *Ireland* into *Britain* in the year of Christ 556. and preaching to the *Picts* in the *North*, whom he converted to the Faith, they bestowed on him the Island of *Hye*, where he built a Monastery: Of which Island (f) *Beda* gives us this account, that for the space of 200. years, (when he writ his History) *Habere autem solet ipsa Insula Rectorem semper Abbatem* PRESBYTERUM, CUJUS JURI, ET OMNIS PROVINCIA, ET IPSI ETIAM EPISCOPI, *ordine inusitato*, DEBENT ESSE SUBJECTI, *juxta exemplum primi Doctoris illius* (Columbani) QUI NON EPISCOPUS SED PRESBYTER EXTITIT ET MONACHUS. Lo here in *Britain* it self, we finde in the first Conversion of the Northern parts thereof amongst the *Picts*, Bishops themselves for two hundred years space or more, subject even of right and custom to a Presbyter and Monk as their Superintendent, and he no way subject to their Episcopal jurisdiction. *Notkerus Balbulus* from this passage of *Beda* informs us, * That the Abbot of *Hye*, *contra morem Ecclesiasticum* *PRIMATEM OMNIUM HIBERNENSIUM HABITUM ESSE EPISCOPORUM*, as well as the Primate of the *Bishops* in the Northern parts; and that not simply as an *Abbot*, but as an Abbot *Presbyter* joyntly, or principally as a *Presbyter*; in which capacity alwayes he Ordained both Preists and Bishops. This Abbot Presbyter, his Monks and successors, did not

a De Gestis Scotorum, l. 2.
b Scotichron. l. 3 c. 8.
c Scotorum Hist. l. 6. f. 92. & l. 7. f. 98.
d Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi, sect. 34. §. 14, 15.
e Beda Eccles. Hist. l. 3. c. 4. & 5.
f Hist. l. 3. c. 4. Usserius de Eccles. Brit. Primordiis, p. 701, 702.
* Martyrolog. 5. Id. 1. Iunii.

onely *ordain and send abroad Presbyters and Monks* (as Abbot (a) *Paphnutius* also about the year 422. though no Bishop, but a Presbyter ordained *Daniel* a Presbyter) but even Bishops themselves for sundry ages, who instructed the Picts and *Northern parts* of our Island, and converted them to the Christian faith. Hence our venerable * *Beda* thus writes of King *Oswald*, *Mox, ubi Regnum suscepit, desiderans totam cui præesset gentem fidei Christianæ gratia imbui, &c. misit* AD MAJORES NATU SCOTORUM, *inter quos exulans, ipse Baptismatis Sacramentum, cum his qui secum erant militibus consecutus erat, petens, ut sibi mitteretur Antistes, cujus Doctrina & Ministerio gens quam regebat Anglorum Dominicæ fidei, & dona disceret, & susciperet Sacramenta. Neque aliquanto tardius quod petiit impetravit. Accipit enim* Aidanum, *summæ mansuetudinis & pietatis ac moderationis virum, habentem zelum Dei, quamvis non plene secundum scientiam. Ab hac ergo insula* Hy *ab horum collegio Monachorum ad provinciam* Anglorum *instituendum in Christo, missus est* Aidanus ACCEPTO GRADU EPISCOPATUS, *quo tempore eidem Monasterio* Segerius *Abbas* ET PRESBYTER FUIT, (who conferred the degree of a Bishop upon *Aidan*, though but a Presbyter himself, as learned (b) *David Blondel* observes.) This Bishop *Aidan* coming to *Oswald* King of *Northumberland* to convert his people, is a fit patern for all our Lordly Prelates imitation, which if pursued would much indear both their Persons and Functions to God and all good men, (c) *Cujus doctrina id maxime commendabat omnibus, quod non aliter quam ipse vivebat, cum suis, ipse docebat. Nihil enim hujus mundi quærere, nil amare curabat. Cuncta quæ sibi a Regibus vel a divitibus seculi donabantur, mox pauperibus qui occurrerent, erogare gaudebat. Discurrere per cuncta & urbana & rustica loca, non equorum dorso, sed pedum incessu vectus, nisi si major forte necessitas compulisset, solebat. Quatenus ubicumque aliquos vel divites vel pauperes accedens aspaxisset, confestim ad hos divertens, vel ad fidei suscipiendæ sacramentum, si infideles essent, invitaret; vel fideles in ipsa eos fide comfortaret, atq; ad eleemosinas, bonorumque operum executionem & verbis exaitaret & factis: In tantum autem vita illius a nostri temporis*

a *Io. Cassianus collatio 4. Patrum in Eremo, & c. 1.*

* *Eccl. Hist. l. 3 c. 3. 5.*

b *Apolog. pro sententia Hieronym sect. 30. p. 367, to 371.*

c *Beda, Eccles. Hist. l. 3. c. 5.*

segnicia distabat, ut omnes qui cum eo ineedebant sive adtonsi, sive laici meditari deberent, id est, aut legendis Scripturis aut Psalmis discendis operam dare. Hoc erat quotidianum opus illius, & omnium qui cum eo erant fratrum, Ubicunq; locorum devenissent. And O that this were the daily work of all our Lordly Bishops, Deans and Chapters now! As this Bp. *Aidan*, so divers of our other first Northern Bishops sent out of *Scotland* from *Hy* Abby, were made both *Priests* and *Bishops* too by the Abbots of *Hy*, who were no Bishops but Presbyters, as (a) *Finan*, *Colman*, *Tuda*, *Ceollae*, *Trumbere*, *Ceadda*, and others, all made Presbyters and Bishops by the Abbots of *Hy* their Presbyters and Monks. Yea this was a common practise in that Age, both in *England* and elsewhere, for Bishops themselves who were Monks, to be ordained by and Subject to their Abbots who were Presbyters as well as in *Hy* Abby, as is evident by this 4. Canon of the (b) *Council of Herudford* under *Theodor* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, An. 673. *UT EPISCOPI MONACHI non migrent de loco ad locum, hoc est, de Monasterio ad Monasterium, nisi per dimissionem proprii Abbatis, sed in EA permaneant OBEDIENTIA quam tempore suæ conversionis promiserunt.* Bishops therefore in those days who were Monks (as (c) most Bishops were then) were not only ordained Bishops by their Abbots, being Presbyters, but also subject and obedient to them, even by the Canons of this *Council*, and kept residence in their Monasteries, from whence they could not depart to any other place, Church or Monastery, but by the licence and mission of their Abbot Presbyters. Enough to curb the Pride, and destroy the Monopoly of sole Ordination now claimed by their Lordly Successors. The rather, because not only Presbyters in the first plantation of the Gospel and Christianity amongst the *Picts*, *Scots*, *Britains* and *Saxons*, but also amongst the *French* and *Goths*, ordained both their *Priests* and *Bishops* too, by divine and humane right, until they were restrained by subsequent new Canons made by Bishops themselves, as (d) *David Blondel* proves at large. In imitation of them, and upon the forecited Grounds, Presidents and Texts of Scripture, *Anno Dom.* 1389. the *Lollards*, *Wickliffs*-disciples (as (e) *Walsingham*

a *Beda Eccl. Hist.* l 3 c 17, 21, 22, 25, 26. l 4 c 4. *Davidis Blondelli Apolog* p 369, 370, 371, 372, 373. *Mat. Wilsm. Anno.* 656, 661, 653.

b *Beda Eccl. Hist.* l 4 c 5. *Pelmanni Concil* p 153.

c *See Godwins Catalogue of Bishops.*

d *Apologia, &c.* p 359, to 374.

e *Hist. Angliæ, An.* 1389. p 374.

'*singham* a Monk records) winning very many to their Sect, 'grew so audacious; that their Presbyters, like Bishops, crea-'ted and ordained new Presbyters; affirming, that every 'Priest had received as much power to bind and loose, and 'to Minister other Ecclesiastical things, as the Pope himself 'giveth or could give. This power of ordination they exerci-'sed in the Dioceſs of *Salisbury*: And those who were or-'dained by them, thinking all things to be lawful to them, pre-'sumed to celebrate Masses, and feared not to handle Di-'vine things, and administer the Sacraments. This wicked-'nes (as the Popish Prelates and Monks then reputed it) 'was discovered by a certain man ordained a Minister by 'them, to the Bishop of *Salisbury* at his mannor of *Sunnyng*; By which it is apparent that the *Lollards* and *Wickliffists* (the Protestants of that age) believed that the power of Ordination belonged as much to Presbyters by Gods Law, as to Bishops or Popes; that one of them might as lawfully ordain Ministers as the other; and (a) that as *they might lawfully preach the Gospel without the Bishops license* (first prescribed by the forged *Statute*, of 2 H. 5. c. 15. made only by the Bishops without the Commons consent, to suppress the preaching of the Gospel) so likewise ordain Ministers without it; and that Ministers ordained only by Presbyters without a Bishops privity or assistance, were lawful Ministers, and might lawfully with a good conscience discharge all Ministerial offices. This being not only their received Doctrin, but their practice too. Moreover I find that (b) *Jan.* 20. 1542. *Nicholas Amsdorffius, a noble and learned unmarried man, was ordained Bishop of Newburg, by* Martin Luther, *Dr. Nicholas Medler, Pastor of Newburg, George Spalatine of* Aldenburg, *and Wolffgangus Steinius of Lucopetra, joyning with him in the imposition of hands; Which ordination* Luther *afterwards publickly maintained to be lawful, in a Printed Treatise.* Lo here we have Presbyters not onely ordaining a Presbyter, but a Bishop, of late, as well as former times. If therefore the Prelates Paradox be true; *That he who ordains, is greater in Jurisdiction and degree, then he that is ordained*; It will hence inevitably follow, that these Presbyters (and those who ordained

a This was the Doctrine & practice of all our Martyrs, Fox Acts and Monuments, 1610. p 583, 484, 502, 562, 521, 541, 552, 553, 558, 568, 588, 590, 592, 598, 595, 601, 604, 639, 805, 874, 883, 984, 911, 931, 950, 956, 1001, 1006, 1007, 1015, 1016, 1099, 1156, 1218, 1889.

b *Chytraus Chron. Saxoniæ lib.* 25 *p* 456

dained the first Bishops) were greater in Jurisdiction, degree, order then Bishops; And then farewel their pretended Hierarcy: (d) *Anno Dom.* 1537. *Christian the 3 King of Denmark*, 'removed and suppressed by a publique Edict, all the Bishops 'of his Kingdom for their intollerable Treasons and Rebel-'lions, abolished their Lordly Bishopricks, as contrary to 'our Saviours institution, the means that made them idle, 'proud, ambicious, unpreaching Prelates, and sedicious, 'treacherous Rebbels to their Princes; and instead of the '7. Bishops of *Denmark*, he instituted 7. Superintendents, 'to exercise the Office of Bishops, give Orders to others, 'and execute all Ecclesiastical affairs; which 7. Superinten-'dents Aug 26. 1537. received their ordination from *John Bu-'genhagius* a Protestant Minister, in the Cathedral of *Hafnia*, 'in the presence of the King and Senate of *Denmark*. Lo here all Bishops cashiered, as false Rebellious Traytors to their Soveraign, (as they have (b) *usually been in all states and ages*, there having been more notorious Traytors, Rebels, and Conspirators of Bishops, then of all other ranks of men in the world, as I am able to make good) as *contrary to divine institution*, (and so not *Jure Divino*, as they now boast;) and Superintendents *ordained by a mere Presbyter in their stead, to confer orders unto others* in all *the Danish Churches*. *In* (c) *the beginning of reformation in* Germany, *and other places*, Luther *with other Ministers, usually ordained Deacons and Ministers, and set out books of the manner of their ordination, without any Bishops assistance*; Which power of ordination and imposition of hands, hath ever since been practised by Ministers in all reformed Churches, who have abandoned Bishops, (such as ours are, and make themselves) as contrary to Gods word. *Patric Adamson* Archbishop of S. *Andrews* in *Scotland*, in (d) his *Recantation publiquely made in the Synod of Fiffe, April.* 8. 1591. confesseth, *That the office of a Diocæsan Bishop*, Omni authoritate verbi Dei destituitur, & solo politico hominum commento fundatur; *is destitute of all authority from Gods word, and only founded in the politick figment of men; out of which the Primacy of the Pope or Antichrist hath sprung, and it is worthily to be condemned*,

a *Chytraeus ibid p* 434

See my Antipathy of the English Lordly Prelacy to unity and Monarchy. Cent. Magd. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 6, 7, 8, 10, *Antiq. Ecclesiæ Brit. and Godwins Catalogue of Bishops.*

b *Chytraeus Chr. Saxonial.* 14, 15, 16, 17.

c *Patricii Adamsoni Palinodia, p.* 49, 55.

condemned, *because the assembly of the Presbytery*, (penes quem est Jurisdictio & Inspectio, tum in *Visitationibus*, tum *in Ordinationibus*) *which hath the Jurisdictions and Inspection, both in Visitations and in Ordinations, will perform all these things with greater authority, piety and zeal, then any Bishop whatsoever; whose care is for the most part intent, not upon God, or his function, but the World, which he especially serves.* A fatal blow to our Prelates Hierarchy: for if Lord Bishops be not *Jure divino*, and have no foundation in the word of God, then the power of Ordination belongs not to them *Jure divino*, as they are Lord Bishops: neither can, do, or ought they to confer Orders as they are Bishops, but only as they are Ministers. And if so (as is most certain) then this power of Ordination belongs not at all to Bishops as they are Bishops, but only as they are Ministers; and every Minister as he is a Minister, hath as much divine right and authority to give Orders as any Bishop whatsoever; the true reason why antiently among the Papists, as (*a*) *Durandus* confesseth, and now too, as the *Rhemists* witness; and (*b*) even in our own English Church among us at this day, Ministers ought to joyn with the Bishops in the imposition of hands; neither can our Bps. ordain any one a Minister, unless three or four Ministers at least joyn with them in the ordination and laying on of hands. This being an apparent truth, I shall hence, from the Bishops own principles, prove Presbyters superior to, and greater then Bishops in Jurisdiction, dignity and degree. Those (say they) to whom the power of Ordination belongs by divine right, are greater in Jurisdiction, dignity, and degree, then those whose have not this power, and the ordainer, is higher, superior in all these, then the ordained. But the power of Ordination belongs *Jure divino* only to Presbyters, as Presbyters, not to Lord Bishops; and if to Lord Bishops, yet not as Bishops but as Presbyters; and Bishops when they ordain in a lawful manner, do it only as Presbyters, not as Bishops; therefore Presbyters are superiour to Bishops in jurisdiction, order, and degree; and Bishops themselves, far greater in all these as they are Presbyters (an office of divine institution) then as they are Lord-

(*a*) Rationalis divinorum l. 2. de Sacerdote Rubrica.

(*b*) See the book of ordination, and Canon, 35

ly Prelates, or Diocæsan Bishops, a mere humane invention. Thus are our great Lord Bishops (who (a) *vaunt of the weakness of Puritan principles*, whereas their Episcopal are far more feeble and absurd) wounded to death with their own weapons, and all their domineering, swelling authority, overthrown by that very principle, foundation, on which they have presumed to erect it; the ancient Proverb being here truly verified, *Vis consilii expers mole ruit sua.* I shall close up this with the words of accute (b) *Antonius Sadeel*, who after a large proof of Bishops and Presbyters to be both one and the same by Divine institution, windes up all in this manner: *We conclude therefore, seeing that superiour Episcopal dignity, to be avouched onely by humane institution,* tantum esse humani juris, *that is onely of humane right: On the contrary, since it is evident by the expresse testimonies of Scripture, that in the Apostles times, Bishops were the same with Presbyters*, Jure Divino potestatem Ordinandi non minus Presbyteris quam Episcopis convenire, *that by Gods law, and Divine right, the power of Ordination belongs no less to Presbyters, then to Bishops.*

a *See Bishop White his Epistle Dedicatory to the Archbishop of Canterbury, before his Treatise of the Sabbath.*

b *Responsio ad Turriani Sophism. mata pars 2. fol. 18.*

And with Learned (c) *David Blondel*, who after a large proof out of Scripture, Antiquity, History, Fathers, Councils, and other Writers; *that the right of Ordination belongs to Presbyters as Presbyters*, and not onely to *Bishops*; concludes with these six Arguments.

c *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi sect. 3. p. 378.*

1. Those to whom the practice of the Church hath assigned the same functions, *de facto*, the same she professeth to have by themselves the self same dignity and parity in all things from the beginning.

But the practice of the Church hath assigned the same functions of confirming, ORDAINING PRIESTS AND DEACONS, preaching, administring the Sacraments, &c. to Presbyters and Bishops.

Therefore she professeth a Bishop and Presbyter to have by themselves the self same dignity and parity in all things from the beginning.

2. Whatsoever things are known to be prohibited by new Rules and Canons, were free before the Rules and Ca-

But to confirm, consecrate, reconcile, ordain Presbyters, &c. are known to be prohibited by new Rules and Canons to Presbyters.

Therefore they were free before the Rules and Canons made.

3. What things soever were free before, by accession of a new consent of Churches, may afterwards become free to Presbyters as well as Bishops.

But to confirm, consecrate, ordain, &c. were free before.

Therefore they may (now) by accession of a new consent of Churches, become free again for after times.

4. Novel rules are not the Primordial, truly Divine, and Apostolical *Law* of the Church, but humane onely.

The rules by which these functions of conferring, consecrating, ordaining Ministers, &c. are known to be reserved to Bishops, and prohibited to Presbyters, are Novel.

Therefore they are not the Primordial, truly Divine, and Apostolical Law of the Church, but humane onely.

5. All humane Laws may be abrogated by the same will and power whereby they are made and received, to wit, humane.

But the rules by which these powers (of ordaining Presbyters, &c.) are known to be reserved to Bishops, and prohibited to Presbyters, are humane Laws.

Therefore they may be abrogated by the same will and power, to wit, humane.

6. Whatsoever Church out of her own free Liberty, or will, hath abrogated any humane Law, to which she had in any sort before consented, since she used her proper and indefectable power therein, ought not to incur the reprehensions of other Churches.

But the Church of the Protestants, in restoring the ancient identity and parity of Bishops and Presbyters, and Ordination of Presbyters by the Presbyteries, hath out of her own free Liberty, abrogated the humane Law to which she had before consented.

Therefore the Church of the Protestants in restoring the ancient identity and parity of Bishops and Presbyters, and or-

dination of Presbyters by the Presbyteries (without any Diocæsan Bishop) since the hath used her proper and indefectible power therein, ought not to incur the Reprehension of other Churches.

Muchless then (by all these Arguments) ought our Ministers ordained, or Presbyters ordaining Ministers without the Bishops concurrence, during our late Wars and Revolutions, to be censured, reviled, or their ordinations proclaimed *null* void (and by consequence their baptizing, and consecrating of the Lords Supper *null* likewise) by any of our Bishops or Prelatical Clergy, or their Adherents, until they are able clearly to demonstrate them to be such, against all the preceding Testimonies, Precedents, Texts and Arguments here produced to the contrary; which they can never do.

Object. 5. If any finally object, That the Fathers stile *Titus* the first Bishop of *Crete*, and *Timothy* of *Ephesus*, therefore they were Diocæsan Bishops, and superiour in jurisdiction and degree to other Ministers, and so by consequence are other Diocæsan *Bishops* superior to Presbyters as well as they.

Answ. 1. I answer, *First*, that neither S. *Paul*, nor S. *Luke*, who lived in their times, and knew them far better then any Father or Writer since, ever so much as once term or stile them Bishops; much less, the first or sole Diocæsan Bishops of *Crete*, or *Ephesus*; which no doubt they would have done, had they been in truth Diocæsan *Bishops* there; and the name, the Office of such a *Bishop* so honourable and sublime above that of Ministers, even *Jure Divino*, as our Prelates and their Flatterers now pretend. Their Testimonies therefore, who stile them onely *Ministers* or *Evangelists*, (never *Bishops*) is to be preferred before all Fathers and Writers, (who stile them *Bishops*) being neither acquainted with their Persons or Functions, nor living in their Age.

a 1 Tim. 4. 5, 6. 2 Tim. 4. 5. 1 Thes. 3. 2.

Secondly, No Father ever stiles them, or either of them a Diocæsan, or sole *Bishop* of *Crete* or *Ephesus* (the thing which ought to be proved) *but Bishops onely*, as they stiled other Ministers, *the name, the Office of Bishops and Presbyters, being but one and the same, and promiscuously used in the Apostles*

times; all Presbyters being then called Bishops, and all Bishops Presbyters; as is evident by Acts 14.23. c. 20. 17, 28. Phil. 1. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3. Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7. Tim. 3. 3. 1, 2, 3. 2 John 1.3. John 1. Philemon 9. and all ancient, all modern Commentators on these Texts confess. Whence the *Translators of our last authorized English Bible*, affix these *Contents to* Tit. 1. 6. to 10. (which treats of the qualities of Bishops,) *How they that are to be chosen MINISTERS ought to be qualified:* And the *Book of Ordination of Ministers*, confirmed by two (a) *several Acts of Parliament*) prescribes the 1 *Tim.* c. 3. *Acts* 20. and *Titus* 1. *to be read both at the ordination of Ministers, and Consecration of Bishops:* And so intimates, yea interprets, that Bishops and Ministers in the Scriptures language, are both one, in name, office, and were so reputed in the primitive Church.

See Espencæus Dig. in Tim. 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 1.

a 5 & 6 Edw. 6 c. 1. 8 Eliz. c. 1.

Thirdly, The Fathers use the words, *Elders and Bishops, promiscuously*, calling Elders Bishops, and Bishops Elders: Hence *Papias the Auditor of S.* John, *and companion of Polycarpus*, writes thus *in the Preface of his Books*, (b) *It shall not seem grievous unto me, if that I compile in writing, and commit to memory, the thing which I learned of the Elders. If any came in place which was a follower of the Apostles, forthwith I demanded the words of the Elders: What* Andrew, *what* Peter, *what* Philip, *what* Thomas, *or* James, *or* John, *or* Matthew, *or any other of the Lords Disciples? What* Ariston, *and the Elder* John, *Disciples of the Lord, had said?* Here he stiles, not onely Bishops, but even the Apostles *Elders. Polycarpus*, his companion and Coætanian, writes thus in *his Epistle to the Philippians*, (c) *Be ye subject to Presbyters and Deacons, as to God: let the Presbyters be simple and merciful in all things.* Now those whom he here stiles *Presbyters*, S. *Paul* expresly terms *Bishops*, Philip. 1. 1. *Justine Martyr in his second Apologie*, used neither the name Bishop nor Elder, but terms the Minister onely, *He who is set over the Brethren, he who holds the first place, in reference* to the Deacon, who holds the second place, not to any Elders of an inferior order to a Bishop. And lest any one should dream, that *Justine Martyr* here speaks of a *Bishop*; *Tertullian*, who lived near about that time, or

b Euseb. Eccle. Hist l, 3. c. 39. p 55

c Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom. 1, p 96

within

within few years after, in his (a) *Apologie* writes thus, *Præſident nobis probati quique Seniores, &c. Approved Elders* (not Biſhops) *preſide over us, having obtained this honour, not with any price, but a good teſtimony.* Whence it is evident, that in his age, every Chriſtian Congregation had *divers Elders*, (not one Diocæſan Biſhop) *over it, to feed and rule it*, according *to the practiſe of the Apoſtles times*, Acts 14.23. c. 20. 17, 28. c. 21, 18. Philip. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 5. 17. Tit. 1. 5. James 5. 14. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2. Hence learned (b) *Apollinarius*, calls *the Biſhops and Elders of the Church of Ancyra in Galatia, Presbyters.* And (c) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, relating the *ſtory of the young man delivered by S. John to a Biſhop, to train up in the fear of God, twice together calls him*, interchangeably, *both a Biſhop and an Elder*, as *Meridith Hamner* (a Biſhop) Engliſheth it. So (e) *Irenæus*, one of the ancienteſt of all the Fathers, ſtiles *Polycarpus Biſhop of* Smyrna, that *Holy and Apoſtolick Elder*: Yea, he terms the Biſhops of *Rome* themſelves *Elders*; (e) 'They (ſaith he) that were Elders before *Soter*, 'of the Church which now thou governeſt; I mean *Ana*'*cletus, Pius, Hyginus, Theleſphorus*, and *Xyſtus*, neither did 'ſo obſerve it themſelves, neither left they any ſuch Com'mandment to poſterity. And the ſame Father *Adverſus, Hæreſes*, l. 2. c. 39. l. 3. c. 2. & l. 4. c. 43, 44. 'oftentimes ſtiles Bi'ſhops Elders, and Elders Biſhops; making Presbyters e'qual to Biſhops in all reſpects, and Succeſſors to the A'poſtles as well, as much as they. So (g) *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, in his Epiſtle to *Xyſtus*, Biſhop of *Rome*, about the year of Chriſt, 240. writes thus, 'There was a certain bro'ther reputed to be of our Church, and Faith, very aged, '*& priuſquam ego etiam creatus Epiſcopus*, and created A 'BISHOP before I was, and, as I think, before bleſſed '*Heraclas* was made a Biſhop. Where he expreſly terms this party, who was but a Miniſter or Presbyter onely in that Church a *BISHOP*, and ſaith, *he was created a Biſhop*, when he was but ordained a Miniſter. And that famous *Gregory Nazianzen* (three hundred and ſeventy years after Chriſt) *in his 9, 13, 15, 21, and 28. Orations, p. 262, 375, 368, 479.* as *Elias Cretenſis*, in his *Commentary on thoſe places*

a Apolog. c 39 Tom. 1. p 692, 693, 694

b Euſebius Eccleſ. Hiſt. l 5 c 16.

c Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l 3. c 23

d Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l 5. c. 20

e Ibid. c 26

f Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l 5. c. 8.

teſtifieth, *uſeth the words Biſhops and Presbyters reciprocally, ſtiling Biſhops Presbyters, and Presbyters Biſhops; making them all one by Dizine Inſtitution, and different onely by humane invention, which difference he heartily wiſheth might be aboliſhed*; himſelf *voluntarily reſigning his Biſhoprick of* Conſtantinople *to betake himſelf to a more private and retired life.* In brief, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Jerome*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, *Sedulius*, *Primaſius*, *Rhemigius*, *Beda*, *Rhabanus Maurus*, *Haymo*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact. Anſelmus*, *Bruno*, *Aquinas*, *Lyra*, and all ancient and modern Commentators whatſoever on *Phil.* 1. 1. 1 *Tim.* 3. *Tit.* 1. and *Acts* 20. *Claudius Eſpencæus*, *Digreſſ. in* 1 *Tim. l.* 1. *c.* 1, 2. with all foreign and domeſtick Aſſerters of Epiſcopacy whatſoever, are forced to confeſs, that S. *Paul* himſelf, and all ancient Fathers and Writers, did uſe the words *Biſhops* and *Preshyters* promiſcuouſly, ſtiling Presbyters Biſhops, and Biſhops Presbyters: Which *Hincmarus* Biſhop of *Rhemes*, in his book to his Nephew *Hincmarus* Biſhop of *Laudunum*, cap. 10. (much about the year 870. in the Council of *Artoyes*) thus expreſſeth and reſolves, *Epiſcopi & Presbyteri in primordio naſcentis Eccleſiæ & uſque ad non paruum temporis progreſſum UNO NOMIME IN SINGULIS OFFICIIS VOCABANTUR, ſicut in Epiſtola Petri, & in Epiſtolis Joannis, & in Epoſtolis Pauli manifeſtatur, &c. ſicut Hieronimus ad Evagrium Presbyterum auctoritate Scripturarum oſtendit.* To this in his *Epiſtola Epiſcopis Franciæ*, *Anno* 885. *c.* 4. he addes out of *Beda*, *Primis Eccleſiæ temporibus* (*ut Apoſtolica ſcriptura teſtis eſt*) *UTRIQUE PRESBYTERI, UTRIQUE EPISCOPI VOCABANTUR; quorum uni ſapientiæ maturitatem, alteri induſtriam curæ paſtoralis ſignificant; quorum licet in quibuſdam ſint diſtincta Officia dignitatum, uno nomine ſacræ regulæ comprehendunt.* The Fathers therefore thus promiſcuouſly uſing the name Biſhop and Presbyter, ſtilling Biſhops Presbyters, and Presbyters Biſhops, and making both of them one and the ſame by divine inſtitution, their ſtiling of *Timothy* and *Titus* Biſhops of *Epheſus* and *Crete*, is no argument or proof at all, that they were Diocæſan, or ſole Biſhops of thoſe places; or that they then had, or any Biſhops now have, by divine inſtitution, any Epiſcopal juriſdiction and preheminence

See his life before his works.

preheminence over other Presbyters or Ministers, or were superior to them in order, dignity or degree.

Fourthly, The ancientest Fathers, Popes, Councils, and Ecclesiastical Historians do *usually stile* the Assembly and Common-council of the Bishops, & Elders, a Presbytery, not Episcopy, (*a*) Πρεσβυτεριον, or *Presbyterium*, not *Episcopium*, as being the most worthy and ancient; witness not onely 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. but *Clem. Alexandrinus, strom. l.* 6. *Origen apud Euseb. l.* 6. *c.* 20. *Cyprian Epist.* 46. *Synodus Ancyræ, hæres.* 57, 69. *Basilius in Esaiæ, c.* 3. Pope *Liberius, Epist. ad Valentem. An.* 357. Pope *Syricius, Epist.* 2. *An.* 390. Pope *Innocent, Ep.* 13. *An.* 406. Pope *Gelasius, Epist.* 7. *c.* 8. and other testimonies; yea, the best and eminenest primitive Bishops and Popes too in their Epistles and Writings, did usually stile the Presbyters under them συμπρεσβυτεροι, *Compresbyteri*, or *Fellow-Presbyters*; *Comministri, Fratres*, their *Fellow-Ministers, Colleagues, Brethren*; as is evident by *Dionysius Alexandrinus, apud Euseb. l.* 7. *c.* 11. S. *Cyprian, Epist.* 26, 30, 31, 38, 41, 45, 50, 66, 72, 77. *Athanasius, Epist. ad Joannem & Antiochum, Basilius, Ep.* 9, 10, 11, 58, 59, 70. *Greg. Nazianzen, Oratio* 51. *Epist.* 23, 29, 33, 35, 36, 88, 91, 92, 152, 216. *Eusebius, Eccles. hist. l.* 7. *c.* 20, 30. Pope *Siricius, Epist.* 2. Pope *Innocentius, Epist.* 10. 11. 15, 17, 34. *Jerom. Epist.* 98. *Epiphanius, Epist. ad Acatium & Paulum, hæres.* 42. *Augustinus, Epist.* 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 81, 86, 104, 105, &c. to which the Epistles of Pope *Leo*, *Gregory* the first, *Rhemigius*, and other Popes and Bishops might be added, without number. And not onely so, but the Presbyters did sit and vote joyntly with the Bishops in all *ancient Councils*, and joynd with them not only in their subscriptions, but likewise in all publique censures, Letters to Emperors, Churches, other Bishops and Presbyters; as is evident by the Councils and Synodical Epistles collected by *Crab, Binius, Surius, Syrmond*, Sir *Henry Spelman*, and others, and proved at large by learned *David Blondel*. Therefore the parity and identity of their Names, Titles, Offices, Powers, joynt actions, censures, ordinations, ministrations as fellow-Presbyters, Colleagues, Associates in Councils, Synods, Presbyteries, infallibly argues the ancient primodial parity, identity of their Office, Dignity and degree by Divine institution,

See Davidis Blondel. Apol. prō sent. Hier. p 89. 90, 91, 197 to 216. 135 to 142.

An. 314. can. 18. Euseb. Eccl. hist. l. 6. c 23. Epiphanius.

tion, till distinguished in after ages in some particulars, by the Canons of ambitious, Usurping Popes and Prelates, as their stoutest Champions are inforced to confess.

Fifthly, The Greek word ἐπίσκοπος, which we English a *Bishop*, signifies properly nothing else, but *an Overseer, Surveyor, Superintendent, or Administrator*, and is oft times applied both by *Greek Authors*, and the *Septuagint Greek Translators*, to secular offices. (a) Hence *Homer* stiles *Hector, the Bishop of the City*: In the Verses of *Solon* in *Demosthenes*, *Pallas* is called *the Bishop* of *Athens*; *Plutarch* in the life of *Numa*, stiles *Venus, the Bishop over the dead*, and he there makes mention of a *Bishop of the Vestal Virgins*. *Suidas* records, *that in the Athenian Republique, those who are sent to the Cities under their jurisdiction, to oversee the affairs of their companions, were called Bishops*. *Cicero* in his seventh Book to *Atticus*, writes thus, Pompey *will have me to be the Bishop of all* Campagnia, *and the Maritime Coasts, to whom the choice and sum of the business may be referred*. And in the *Pandects*, the Clerks of the Markets are called *Bishops*. The *Septuagint*, Numb. 13. read *the Bishops of the Army*. 4 *Kings* 11. they read, *the Bishops who are over the Army, and Bishops over the house of the Lord*. Where Watchmen, Gardians, and Overseers, are called Bishops, 2 Chron. 34. *The Overlookers of the Workmen*, are stiled Bishops; Judges 9. *Zebul is called Abimelechs Bishop* in the Greek; which we now English, *his Officer*: So *Numb.* 4. 16. The office of *Eliazar, in the Tabernacle of the Lord, and the function of Judas*, Psal. 109. 8. *is termed* ἐπισκοπὴ, a *Bishoprick*, by the Septuagint; and so expresly stiled by the Holy Ghost himself, and Englished by us, Acts 1. 20. *His Bishoprick let another take*. Yea, *Constantine the Great* (as (c) *Eusebius* records in his life) *inviting some Bishops to a feast, called himself a Bishop in their presence, uttering these words, You*, saith he, *are Bishops within the Church, but I am constituted of God a Bishop without the Church*. Our New Translators, *Acts* 20. 28. render the Greek word ἐπισκόπους Bishops (the title which the Holy Ghost gives *to the Elders of the Ch. of* Ephesus) *Overseers*; Luke 19. 44. *The time of Gods visitation and overthrow of* Jerusalem *is termed*, ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, &c. Luke 1. 6, 7, 8. c. 7.

a *Aretius Theolog. Problemata, Locus* 62. *De Officiis Eccles. Sect.* 9. *p.* 184, 186. *Chemnitius Exam. Concilii Tridentini par.* 2. *De Sacramento Ordinis c.* 4. *p.* 223, 224. *Iliad.* 1. 10

Ioannis Harmar Lexicon Græc Lond. 1638. *col.* 1473, 1474, 1475.

b *De Vita Constant. l.* 4. *c.* 24.

8. c. 7. 16. Heb. 2. 6. The Greek word which we translate, *hath visited us*, is ἐπισκέψατο. Whence the day of Gods gracious visitation of his people to convert them to him in mercy, is called *by the holy Ghost*, 1 Pet. 2. 12. ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς *The day of visitations* yea our very visiting of sick persons, Prisoners, Orphans and Widdows, is termed by Christ and the holy Ghost himself, (though a meer act of charity, humility, and Christian duty, * not of Jurisdiction and Lordly Prelacy,) ἐπισκέπτεσθαι Matth. 25. 36. 43. and ἐπισκεπτόμενοι ἐπισκέψασθε Jam. 1. 27. *to visit or to play the Bishops part and duty*; which the meanest Christian, yea women (though uncapable of sacred orders) may do and ought to perform, as well as any others. So intermedling with other mens affairs, or coveting of any other mens offices of what condition soever, is termed by the Apostle, 1 Pet. 4. 15. ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος *the playing as it were the Bishop in another mans Dioceſs*. Yea every Ministers feeding and taking the oversight of his proper flock, is stiled, the *doing of a Bishops office*: and those Presbyters who do thus, are not only said to be ἐπισκοποῦντες, 1 Pet. 5. 2. *Heb.* 12. 15. that is, *men executing the office & duty of a Bishop*; but likewise stiled, ἐπίσκοποι; that is, true and proper Bishops: (a name given only to Presbyters & to none but them in holy Scripture, Acts 20. 28. Phil. 1 1. Tit. 1. 7. *and to Christ himself, who is stiled*, ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, The Bishop of our Souls, 1 Pet. 2. 25. but not to any Apostle, Evangelist, Diocæsan or other Prelate; none such being particularly termed a *Bishop* throughout the whole New Testament: The Fathers make Bishops and Overseeers all one, ‖ ‘deriving the ‘very name of a Bishop, from a Greek verb, which signifieth to overlook, watch, ward, or take care of. *Hence* ‘*Augustine writes thus*; He did keep, he was careful, he did ‘watch, as much as he could, over those over whom he was ‘set. And Bishops do thus. For therefore an higher place is set ‘for Bishops, that they may superintendent, and as it were ‘keep the people. For that which in Greek is called a Bishop, ‘that in Latine is interpreted a Superintendent, because he ‘overseeth, because he seeth from above. For like as an higher place is made for the Vineyardkeeper, to keep the Vineyard,

* *So is the word used by Basil. Epist. 52. not to ride in visitation like a Lordly Prelate, but to consider of the miserable state of the Church & to be careful for it; as Bishop Iewel wisneſseth in his Defence of the Apology of the Church of Engl. part 2 63 Div. 5. p 10.*

† *Enarratio in Psal. 126. Tom. 8. p. 726, 727.*

'yard, so an higher place also is made for the Bishops. And 'a perillous account is to be rendred of this high place, un- 'less we stand therein with such an heart, that we may be un- 'der your feet in humility, and pray for you, that he who 'knows your minds, he may keep you; because we can see you 'entring and going out, but yet we are so far from seeing what 'you think in your hearts, that we cannot so much as see what 'you do in your Houses. How therefore do we keep you? like 'men, as much as we can, as much as we have received. We keep 'you out of the office of dispensation, but we will be kept to- 'gether with you; we are as Pastors to you, but under that Pa- 'stor (*Christ*,) we are sheep together with you: we are as teachers 'to you out of this place, but under that one Master we are as 'Scholars with you in this School. If we will be kept by him 'who was humbled for us, & is exalted to keep us, let us be hum- 'ble. * Those set themselves before Christ, who will be high 'here where he was humble. Let them therefore be humble 'here, if they will be exalted there, where he is exalted. *In an other place he writes thus.* ‖ 'For this cause the Apostle saith, 'He that desires a Bishoprick, desires a good work. He would 'expound what a Bishoprick is; * it is a name of labor not 'of honor. For it is a Greek word, and derived from hence, 'that he who is made an Overseer, overseeth those, over whom 'he is set, namely by taking care of them. For ἐπὶ is over, but 'σκοπὸς is intention, overseeing or care: therefore if we will 'render ἐπισκοπεῖν in Latine, we may say it is to play the 'Superintendent; that he may understand, that he is not a 'Bishop, who delights to be over others, but not to profit 'them. *On which words* Ludovicus Vives *thus Comments; The* 'name of a Bishop is derived either from ἐπισκοπέω, which 'signifieth to consider, or from ἐπισκοπτομαι, which signifieth 'the same, and to visit. Whence *Suidas saith*, there were some 'sent from the *Athenians* to the Cities under them, who should 'look into their affairs: and these were called Bishops, that 'is, as it were Overseers, or Visitors, and Observers. In holy 'Scriptures, a Bishop is commonly called, a Watchman, as in *Ezekiel* 3. 17. c. 33. 2, 6, 7. and in Hosea 5. 1. The Lord com- 'plaineth that the Bishops were made a snare on Mizpha, (or 'in the watch Tower) and a net spread upon Tabor; as if he

* *Let our great proud Prelates mark this well.*

† *De Civitate Dei. l. 19. c. 19. Tom. 5. pars 2, p. 516.*

* *Episcopatus nomen est operis non honoris, non dominium, sed officium: non honos sed onus, Hierom. Sedulius, Primasius. Theodoret, Beda Haymo, Rabanus Maurus, Occumenius, Anselmus. Tim 3. Isidor Hispalensis, De Eccles. Officiis, l. 2. c. 5. Gratian Caus. 6 qu. 1.*

Ezekiel 3. 17. c. 33. 2, 6, 7. and in Hosea 5. 1.

c had spoken of the (*a*) Bishops of this age, who lay snares in
c their Bishopricks, & large nets to catch money, but not with a *Note this*
c thin holes or threads, lest the gift should swim through: yea,
c now it is so provided by the diligence and wits of certain
c men, that without evasion of this Law, a Bishoprick may not
c onely be lawfully desired, but likewise bought and sold.
c S. *Chrysostome* in his 10 *Hom.* upon 1 *Tim.* S. *Hierome* in his
c Epistle to *Evagrius*, *Beda* on 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. *Anselm* on *Phil.* 1. 1.
c *Aquinas secunda, secundæ: Qu.* 184. *Art.* 6. *Petrus de Pa-*
c *lude, de Potest. Coll. Apol. Art.* 1. (all cited by Bishop *Jewel*
c in the *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, part*
c 6. *c.* 2. *Divis.* 1. *p.* 523.) and S. *Bernard* also, *de Consid. at.*
c *ad Eugenium, l.* 2, & 3. joyntly resolve, That a Bishop is
c nothing else, but a Superintendent, Watchman, or Over-
c seer, and that he is called a Bishop from hence, that he over-
c seeth, surveyeth, or watcheth over others, with which all
c ancient and modern Writers, whether Foreign or Dome-
c stick, Papists or Protestants accord. Hear onely Dr. *John Po-*
c *net* Bishop of *Winchester*, in his Apology against Dr. *Martin*, *in*
c *defence of Priests mariage*, *c.* 4, 5. *p.* 44, 52, 53, 54. *who as he there* a As did *Wiclif*
c *expresly reckons up* (a) Popes, Cardinals, BISHOPS, Priests, and others be-
c Monks, Canons, Friers, &c. to be the Orders of Antichrist; fore him, *Dial*
c (*b*) taxing them likewise severely, and comparing them with *l.* 3. *c.* 17, 18.
c Eustathian Hereticks, for refusing to wear usual garments, b *Fol.* 1. 5.
c and putting upon them garments of strange fashions, to vary
c from the common sort of people in apparel: *So he thus*
c *determines of the names, Bishop and Superintendent:* And fur-
c ther, whereas it pleaseth *Martin* not onely in this place, but
c also hereafter to gest at the name of Superintendent, he
c sheweth himself bent to condemn all things that be good,
c though in so doing he cannot avoid his open shame. Who
c knoweth not that the name Bishop hath so been abused, that
c when it was spoken, the people understood nothing else,
c but a great Lord, that went in a white Rochet, with a wide
c shaven Crown, and that carrieth an oyl box with him,
c where he used once in seven year, riding about to confirm
c children, &c. Now to bring the people from that abuse,
c what better means can be devised, then to teach the people

'their errour by another word out of the Scriptures of the 'same signification: Which thing by the term Superintendent 'would in time have been well brought to pass. For the or- 'dinary pains of such as were called Superintendents, should 'have taught the people to understand the duty of the Bishop, 'which you Papists would fain have hidden from them. And 'the word *Superintendent* being a very Latine word made 'English by use, should in time have taught the people by 'the very Etymologie and proper signification, what thing 'was meant, when they heard that name which by this term 'Bishop, could not so well be done, by reason that Bishops 'in the time of Popery were Overseers in name, but not in- 'deed. So that their doings could not teach the people their 'names, neither what they should look for at their Bishops 'hands. For the name Bishop, spoken amongst the unlearn- *Note.* 'ed, signified to them nothing less then a Preacher of Gods 'word, because there was not, nor is any thing more rare in 'any Order of Ecclesiastical persons, then to see a Bishop 'preach, whereof the doings of the Popish Bishops of *England*, 'can this day witness; but the name Superintendent should 'make him ashamed of his negligence, and afraid of his idle- 'ness, knowing that S. *Paul* doth call upon him to attend to *Acts* 20. 17, 28 'himself, and to his whole flock; of the which sentence, our 'Bishops mark the first piece right well (that is, to take heed 'to themselves, but they be so deaf, they cannot hearken to 'the second) that is, to look to their flock. I deny not, but 'that the name Bishop may be well taken, but because the 'evilness of the abuse hath marred the goodness of the word, 'it cannot be denied, but that it was not an ill to joyn for a 'time another word with it in his place, whereby to restore 'that abused word to his right signification. And the name 'Superintendent is such a name, that the Papists themselves '(saving such as lack both learning and wit) cannot finde fault 'withal. For *Peresius* the Spaniard and an Archpapist (out of 'whom *Martin* hath stolen a great part of his book) speaking 'of a Bishop, saith, *Primum Episcopi munus, nomen ipsum pre- 'se fert, quod est Superintendere, Episcopus enim Superintendens 'interpretatur, visitans aut supervidens*, &c. that is to say, the chief

'chief Office of a Bishop by interpretation, signifieth a Super-
'intendent, a Visitor, or an Overseer. Why did not *Mar-*
'*tin* as well steal this piece out of *Peresius*, as he did steal all
'the common places that he hath for the proof of the Ca-
'nons of the Apostles, and of Traditions in his second and
'third Chapters? *Martin* in the 88 leaf is not ashamed in his
'book to divide the signification of the terms (Bishop and
'Superintendent) as though the one were not signified by the
'other. But it may be that *Martin*, as the rest of the Popish Sect,
'would not have the name of (*Superintendent*) or Minister used,
'lest that name which did put the people in remembrance of
'sacrificing, and blood-sapping should be forgotten. Since
therefore this title *Bishop*, is thus promiscuously used, both in
prophane and Christian Writers, and in the Scripture it self,
for any Officer, Overseer, Surveyer, Superintendent, Watchman,
Guardian, Pastor or Keeper, as well temporal and civil, as Ec-
clesiastical, and all these their Offices are stiled in Greek, a
Bishoprick: since every Pastor, Watchman, Presbyter, Minister,
Rector and Curate, who takes care of, watcheth over,
feedeth, overlooketh, instructeth, or keepeth the flock
and people committed to his charge, is even in the Scrip-
tures language *called a Bishop*, and said, *to act, to do the office*
of a Bishop: since those who out of charity, love, friendship
go to admonish or visit others, who are either sick, poor, fa-
therless, or otherwise distressed, yea God himself when he
comes to punish or shew mercy unto others, are in the
Greek and Scripture phrase, said, *to visit and play the Bishops*;
as appeareth by the forecited Scriptures, and by Acts 15.36.
Where Paul said to Barnabas, ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἡμῶν,
which we translate, *Let us go again and visit our brethren, in*
every City, where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see
how they do. From which text the *Rhemists would make Bishops*
ordinary visitations, to be Jure Divino: though this was no Lord-
ly Episcopal visitation, such as our Bishops now keep, for we
read of no visitation Articles, Oaths, Fees, or Presentments
in it; neither were *Paul* and *Barnabas* such Bishops, as now,
but it was a meer visitation of love, as one friend visits a-
nother, not of Jurisdiction, as the last words; *And see how*

a See Fulk and Cartwright. ibid. m.

they do; together with the *Council of Laodicea*, *Can.*57. expound it, and verse 14. *Simeon hath declared how God at the first* ἐπισκεψάτο, *did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.* And Acts 7.23. *When Moses was full forty years old, it came into his heart* ἐπισκεψασθαι, *to visit his brethren, the children of Israel*; and since these words ἐπισκεψασθαι, and ἐπισκοποῦντες (that is) *to visit, oversee, or play the Bishop* (*a*) *imply no Lordship, Soveraignty, Dominion, Jurisdiction, or lordly Episcopal authority in them* (at least no such as our Bishops now claim and exercise:) *but rather an act of humility, charity, service, and inferiority to the persons visited*, as is evident by Matth.25.36,43. Acts 7.23. c.15.36. Jam.1.27. Heb 2.6. 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3, 5. It hence unanswerably follows, that Bishops Episcopal Lordly visitations, are not *Jure Divino*, and that other Ministers are as much Visitors, and may visit as well as they; that every Presbyter, Minister, Curate who doth faithfully discharge his duty, (*b*) *is as much, as truly, as properly a Bishop, both in the Scripture language and in Gods account, as any Diocæsan Bishop or Prelate whatsoever*; That those Bishops who merge themselves in pleasures, idleness, or secular affairs, and do not diligently, faithfully and intirely give themselves to preach Gods Word, instruct and teach the people, visit the Fatherless, imprisoned, sick, poor, widows, and flocks committed to them; (which few of our Prelates now deign to do) *are* (c) *in truth, in Gods, in Christs account, and in the Scripture language, no Bishops at all, what ever they pretend*: That the word *Bishop* is (*d*) *not a title of Dominion, Soveraignty, Jurisdiction, Glory, Power, Preheminency, Pomp, State, Authority and Command*, (as our Bishops pretend, who now presume to monopolize it to themselves alone, though common by Gods word and antient writers to every Minister) *but of humility, office, service, labour, care, circumspection, watchfulness, meekness, tenderheartedness, charity, familiarity, and brotherly kindness* (which most Prelates have now quite shaken off.) Therefore the Fathers stiling of *Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, or Titus Bishop of Crete, or both of them Bishops*, will never prove them to be Diocæsan, or sole Bishops or Archbishops of those Churches, that they

a *Bishop Iewel's Defence of the Apolog.*, part 2 c.3. divis.5. p. 107.

b *Marsilius Patavinus Defens. Pacis pars* 2. c. 15, 16. *Richardus Armachanus Resp. ad quæst. Armenorum l.* 11. c.1, to 8. *Fox Acts and Monuments*, p. 1009, 1116, 1466.

c *Bishop Iewel Defence of the Apol part* 2. c 3 divis 7. page 111. *Thomas Beacon his Catechism*, vol. 1. f. 499, 500. *Chrys. Opus imperf. in Mat Hom* 3, & 43. *Ambr. de dign. Sacerd.* c. 4. d *Aug. de Civ. Deil* 19. c 19 *Hierom, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Heymo, Rabanus, Maurus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact Oecumenius, Anselmus, Beda in* 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2 *Bernard de consid. ad Eugen.* 2, & 3.

they had a Superiority or Jurisdiction as they were Bishops over all other Ministers or Presbyters in those Churches; or that Archbishops or Bishops are *Jure divino* superior to, or different in order or degree from Presbyters, *who have the self-same Commission or authority, given them by Christ, as they*; and so have equal authority, power, with them, and are as much Bishops every way by Gods Law, as they; even as every *High Commissionor* of the *Quorum*, is as much an high Commissioner as the Archbishop of *Canterbury* or *York*, and hath as much authority as an High Commissioner, as they; since they have all the self-same Commission, which gives no greater power to one of them then the other, but the same to both. Indeed had Christ given a different Commission to his Apostles and the seventy Disciples; or unto *Timothy* and *Titus*, then to other Elders and Bishops of the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, or to Bishops, than he hath given to Presbyters and Ministers, there might have been some ground to have proved the 12. Apostles, *Timothy*, *Titus* and Bishops, greater in Jurisdiction, power, authority, and degree than the 70. Disciples, Presbyters, and other Ministers, by divine institution. But since it is apparant by * 'the Scriptures *that the* 12. Apostles, and 70. Disciples (*what ever* ‖ 'some men have rashly determined the contrary) 'had but one and the self-same Commission given unto them 'by Christ, being sent out two and two in the same manner, 'the same condition, with the same Mandates, the same 'powers, the same promises, the same comminations against 'those who contemned their Doctrine, *without any discrimination at all between them, (as learned* David Blondellus *proves at large, refuting all authorities and allegations to the contrary,) That* Timothy Titus, *Archbishops, Bishops and other Prelates* 'have no other, no larger Patent, Commission or authority 'granted unto them by Christ, then Presbyters and ordinary Ministers, (*as the book of* Ordination manifests: where 'the same words are used, the same Commission given from 'God to Ministers, at the ordination of every Minister, as 'there is to Bishops at the consecration of any Archbishop or Bishop) since they are all joyned together in one and the 'self-

* *Mat.* 10. 1, *to* 16. *Mark* 6. 7, *to* 12. *Luke* 9. 1, *to* 6. *compared with Luk.* 10. 1, *to* 21.

† *Clemens Epist. apud Surium Tom.* 1. *p.* 141. *and others; who have since followed this surgery of his.*

* *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi Sect.* 3. *p.* 99, *to* 130.

self-same divine Charter, and all claim by one and the self-same grant, (as is evident by Mat. 28. 19, 20. Mark 6. 15, 16. John 20. 22, 23. Acts 1. 8. c. 10. 47. c. 20. 27, 28. Col. 4. 17. 1 Tim. 3. 1, to 7. c. 3. 12, 13. c. 5. 17, 18, 20, 21, 22. c. 6. 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20. 2 Tim. 2. 14, 15, 16. c. 4. 1, to 16. Tit. 1. 5, to 14. c. 2. 1, to 15. c. 3. 1, 2, 8, 9, 10. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. 2 Pet. 1. 12, 13. 1 Cor. 1, 1, 13, 17. c. 3. 4, 5, to 11, 21, 22. c. 4. 1, 6, 7, 17. c. 9. 16, 17. c. 13. 29, 30, 31, 32. Ephes. 4. 11, 12. with other Scriptures) it is most apparent and undeniable, that by Gods word and institution, *they are equal, both in point of office, power, Jurisdiction, and authority, not one of them greater, higher or superior then the other*, having the self-same divine ordination, commission, office, and charge.

* L. 3. c. 4. Eccles. Hist. *Finally*, * *Eusebius* records only, *that Timothy IS REPORTED to be the First Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of the Churches in Crete*? So that all the Fathers authorities, (who follow *Eusebius*,) are grounded onely upon this bare report, not upon any certainty; therefore not to be granted or relyed on. The rather, * *because there have been Anciently in Crete no less then 4. Archbishops, and 21. Bishops Suffraganes*; now is it very improbable that *Paul* would institute *Titus* Archbishop or Superintendent general of all *Crete*, it being so large a circuit having afterwards, so many Archbishops, Bishops Sees within it; and he so little resident in, so often absent from it, as I have manifested in the premises. From all these evidences I presume, I may safely conclude this 2d. Question against the common received Error, *That Titus was never Bishop nor *Archbishop of Crete*, what ever our Prelates and their favourites have written to the contrary: And so *Timothy* being neither a Diocæsan Bishop of *Ephesus*, nor *Titus* of *Crete*, the pretended Hierarchy of our Prelates *Jure Divino*, built only upon the * *sandy foundation* of these two supposed Bishops and their Bishopricks, must needs fall to ruine; and they being now lifted up so high above their fellow brethren, their fall must certainly prove very great.

* See Mercators Atlas Minor. p. 812.

* *Paulus Titum, Archi Episcopum Cretæ constituit. Lyra in argument. ad Tit. Eadem Hieronymus in Tit. So Thomas Alton his Brief review of Episcopacy. p. 4.*

I shall for a Corollary to these two Questions, conclude with those six Arguments and passages of *David*

* Mat. 7. 26, 27

Blon-

Blondellus in his Apologia *pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis & Presbyteris. p.* 190, 191, 192, 193, 194. proving the divine right of Presbyterian Bishops and Presbyters, and disproving the divine right of Diocesan Bishops, Munita jam regia ad certiorem indeflexi veri cognitionem via ex superioribus (velut ex gravida sagittis pharetrâ) altum penetrantia tela tutò depromere licet, quibus armati popularem de *divina*, Episcoporum presbyteriis præpositorum *institutione*, errorem undique confodiendum aggrediamur.

1 Episcopis divinô jure institutis Ecclesia constituta neque caruit unquam, neque carere potuit, neque nunc carere potest; cum eos ad constituendam Ecclesiam summæ & indispensabilis necessitatis (a) Paulina *Διάταξις*, ipsaque Apostolorum (b) praxis absolute requirat. Episcopis presbyteriorum præpositis Ecclesia constituta, & caruit non semel, & carere potuit, & nunc potest, imò aliquandò debet; vacaverat scilicet (ut nova præcedentibus exempla adjiciamus) Romæ sedes post Hygini annô 142 Januarii 11, defuncti dormitionem annis 4, (c) *ad Consulatum Clari & Severi*, cum anno 146 concurrentem, quo tandem suffectus Pius; *Cessavit* rursus post Marcellini martyrium (d) *Episcopatus* (si vulgatum lectionem sequamur) annis *septem mensibus sex, diebus* 25 *persequente Diocletiano Christianos*. sed legendum videtur, *annis* VI *mensib.* 11. *dieb.* 8, ab annô 304 Martii 21, quô *capite truncatus est* Marcellinus, ad anni 309 Maii 29 feriâ 1, quâ sedere cœpit *Consulatu Maxentii* IV *& Maximi* ordinatus Marcellus. *Sanctissima Ecclesia Antiochena per annos* 40 *viduata manente*, (e) anno 742. Constantini Copronymi 1 indict. 10. *Stephanum agrestem quidem sed religiosum, Christianis in Oriente positis sibi Patriarcham habere permisit* Arabum dux Evilid. *Rhemensis* (f) *Ecclesia per multa tempora & per multos annos, sine Episcopo fuit*, ab annô nim. 717 quô ejectus à Carolô Martellô Rigobertus, ad 743 quô Episcopatu donatus Abel, qui *ibi permanere* sedem tenente *Milone clerico* ad Tilpini post Pippini mortem constituti tempora *permissus non fuit*; anno 845, *post decennium*, (g) *quam Ebo amotus fuerat in* eadem *Rhemensi Ecclesia* (quam *Fulco Abbas sive Presbyter diu tenuerat*, ac post eum Notho) Hincmarus constitutus. Hodie qui Alexandriæ & Hierosolymis inter

a *Tit.* 1. 5.
b *Acts* 14. 23.
c *Lib. pont. in Hygino & pro.*
d *In Marcellino & Marcello.*
e *Miscella l.* 22.
f *Hadriani epist apud Flodoard l.* 2. c. 17.
g *Epist. Concil. Tricass. ad Nicolaum Papam.*

inter Christianos residuos sedeat Patriarcha nullus est, &c. Ergo Episcopi presbyteriorum præpositi divinô jure instituti non sunt.

2 Episcopi divinô jure instituti, ubique κατ' πόλιν ἢ κατ' ἐκκλησίαν ex Apostoli ad Titum præceptô constituendi fuerunt, & reverâ ab universis Apostolis (a) eorumque successoribus constituti sunt. Episcopi presbyteriorum præpositi κατ' πόλιν ἢ κατ' ἐκκλησίαν nec constituendi fuerunt, nec reverâ constituti sunt, sed in solis frequentioribus Ecclesiis, clarioribusque urbibus *ne eorum vilescaret* apex: imo nec semper in clarioribus singulis, quandoquidem (b) Babylonis & Ctesiphontis annô 251 Polychronius Martyr, Seleuciæ & Ctesiphontis annô circiter 330. (c) Simeon itidem Martyr Episcopatum tenuit; Ludgero circâ A. D. 795. (d) una in Brachantiâ, altera in Frisiâ, tertia Minrigernfordensis seu *Monasterii* Ecclesia commissia est. (e) Diuinæ annô 655, eoque defunctô Ceollach Trunthere, Iaromano Ceaddæ, Winfrido *Anglorum mediterreanearum Mercicorum & Lindisfarorum* regimen concreditum est; (f) totam West-Saxoniæ plagam quæ posteà in Vuintoniensem & Schireburniensem parœcias divisa est ad annum 70 rexit Hedda. (g) *Dunstano præsule*, qui tandem annô 959 Doroberniam rexit, *Wigornienſis & Londinenſis Eccleſia gloriata eſt*, &c. Ergo Episcopi Presbyteriorum præpositi divinô jure instituti non sunt.

a *Actor.* 11. 23. *Clem. Epist.* p. 54

b *Martyrol. ad Febr.* 17.

c *Sosom. l.* 2. c. 8. *Martyrol. ad April.* 21.

d *Surius ad Martyr.* 26.

e *Beda l.* 3. c. 2. 21. & l. 4. c. 3.

f *Vita Alfhelmi*

g *Vita Dunstani*

3 Episcopos divinô jure institutos plures unà κατ' ἐκκλησίαν consistere fas fuit semper, eritque æternum; cum Paulinæ διαδόξεως vis perpetua sit; imò reipsa (h) Lucâ & Clemente referentibus) constiterunt; Episcopos presbyteriorum fuit unquam nec præpositos plures unà κατ' ἐκκλησίαν consistere, fas nec æternum per Canones erit, imò reipsâ nunquam nisi præter Canones constiterunt. Ergo Episcopi presbyteriorum prepositi, Episcopi divinô jure instituti non sunt.

h *Actor.* 14 23. *Clem. epist. p.* 54 &c.

4 Episcopi divinô jure instituti diaconis (Deô ipsô per Paulum 1 *Tim.* 3. & *Philip.* 1. auctore, & Ecclesiâ primitivâ per Clementem & Polycarpum teste) immediate oppositi sunt. Episcopi presbyteriorum præpositi (medium gradum ex consuetudine & Canonum præscriptô, occupantibus presbyteris) diaconis immediate oppositi non sunt. Ergo

Episcopi

Episcopi Presbyteriorum præpositi, Episcopi divinô jure instituti non sunt.

5 In quos non cadunt, quæcunque Episcopis quos Scriptura divini juris regula, Clementisque epistola, antiquissimum regulæ sacro-sanctæ ἐκπύπωμα memoravere, competunt, ii (qua tales) Episcopi nec divinô jure instituti, nec Ecclesiæ primitivæ exemplô muniti deci possunt. In Episcopos presbyteriorum præpositos non cadunt quæcunque Episcopis quos Scriptura divini juris regula, Clementisque epistola, antiquissimum regulæ sacrosanctæ ἐκπύπωμα memoravere, competunt. Nam nec ad Ecclesiarum constitutionem absolute necessarii sunt, nec κατὰ πόλιν collocari debent, nec plures una in eadem parœcia consistere possunt, nec diaconis immediatê oppositi sunt, prout suprà demonstratum est. Ergo Episcopi presbiteriorum præpositi, quà tales, Episcopi nec divinô jure instituti, nec Ecclesiæ primitivæ exemplô muniti dici possunt.

6 In quos cadunt, quæcunque Episcopis quos Scriptura Clemensque Apostolorum ὁμιλιξ memoravere, competunt, ii divinô jure instituti, ac primitivæ Ecclesiæ exemplo muniti Episcopi reverà sunt & dici possunt. In presbyteros quos vetus Ecclesiæ mos Canonibus confirmatus presbyteriorum præpositis Episcopis subjecit cadunt quæcunqne Episcopis quos Scriptura Clemensque Apostolorum ὁμιλιξ memoravere, competunt: Nam iis Ecclesia constituta, nec caruit, nec carere unquam poterit: iidem κατὰ πόλιν imò κατ' ἐκκλησίαν & constituendi fuerunt, & ubique constituti sunt; plures simul in unaquaque parœciâ & consistere possunt, & reverà consistunt: immediatè denique diaconis oppositi sunt, & singula hæc in confesso sunt. Ergo presbyteri quos vetus Ecclesiæ mos Canonibus confirmatus presbyteriorum præpositis subjecit, divino jure instituti, ac primitivæ Ecclesiæ exemplo muniti Episcopi reverâ sunt & dici possunt.

Viderint fratres Episcopis presbyteriorum præpositis delatæ per Canonens αὐτεξουσίους assertores, quâ fiduciâ primam ejus originem à divino jure repetant, quô ad Ecclesiarum constitutarum regimen (nullâ αὐτεξουσίων factâ mentione) *presbyteri* & *diaconi* soli necessarii pronunciantur: quove consilio eam Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ consuetudinem animo concipiant, quæ

cum divinâ Pauli διατάξει ejus demque accæterorum Coapostolorum clarissimis & antiquissimis monumentis contestatâ praxi consistere nequeat; quasi verò (quod merito absurdam judicabat(a) Innocentius) ab *Apostolis*, *vel ab Apostolicis contrarietatem inductam* suspicari fas sit.

a Epist. ad Decent.

At (inquies) *eminentiores* à Canonibus veterique more factos *presbyteros*, divinitus institutô munere in Ecclesiâ fungi, negari non potest: Assentior lubens; unicus enim ubique est, fuitque ab initiô Christianorum *Episcopatus*, quem *Christi* (sive reverâ in speciem) *servi*, non qua ὑπερέχοντες, *collegarum præsules* & *presbyteriorum præpositi*, sed qua *presbyteri*, πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκαταλεχθέντες *presbyteriorum albo adscripti* administrarunt; ut ἐπισκοπὴ per se considerata, ad Ecclesiarum regimen absolute, ἐπισκοπὴ annexa ὑπεροχὴ ad regiminis modum, solamque εὐταξίαν pertineat; quam suo semper arbitrio permissam seculorum omnium credidit Ecclesia: nec opus sit vel ad triplicis Episcopatus (divini scilicet humani, & satanici) distinctionem, quæ fratrum nostrorum ante annos circiter 50 *quadam teneritudine* (ut Auxiliaris prefecti (b) de Romanis verbis utra) *plus trahi* solitas *aure* acrius pupugit, confugere; vel quicquid humana Christum profitentium consuetudô in divinorum usu ausa est, nefas putare: (c) *lege fidei manente cætera jam disciplinæ & conversationis admittere novitatem correctionis*, suasque in rebus hujusmodi Christianæ prudentiæ partes obire licere in confessô sit; nec ulla (etiam nunc) Ecclesia in exemplum trahi possit, quæ ex generali hoc divini juris (d) præceptô πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω, quæcunque & decentiora, & commodiora sequendi plenâ sibi potestatē factam non censeat.

b Vita Hilarii Arelat.

c Tertul. de virg. vel c. 1.

d 1 Cor. 14. 40

Quisquis igitur inter *presbyteros* Ecclesiæ ministrat; hoc ipso divinitus institutô *Episcopatu* fungitur: quisquis *presbyterii* (sive ad tempus sive in perpetuum) *caput* factus est; præter Episcopatum absolute consideratum humani sibi aliquid ascivit; ac (prout ante 1230 annos (e) Synesius scribebat) *divino operi humano more incumbit*: quisquis adeo insanit, ut προστασίαν ad *semina schismatum tollenda* collatam vitiis obrutus dehoneset, (f) *sicut dispensator administrare non dignatus, sed sicut Dominus sibi vindicare, dignitatemque suam e Sacerdotio in tyrannidem, ex humilitate in superbiamque*

Epist. 57

e Isid. Pelus

f 15 Epist. 21

jejunio in delicias, ex dispensatione in dominatum recidisse ratus, divinam rem *cui Patrum decreta peculiarem quandam sanxere reverentiam* (ut * Zozimi in consimili negotiô verba ad propositum traham) lethali veteris serpentis aurâ afflatus, quantum in ipsô est, violat, ut *Presbyterium* deinceps in Satanæ mancipiô, non secus ac pretiosum margaritum in lutô, aut || *inauris aurea in porci naribus* esse videatur: quisquis denique sublimem pontificatus apicem e capite prolabi sinit, non continuo Episcopatum abdicasse, sed de invidiosâ, quæque adesse & abesse sine noxâ potest, Episcopatus appendice minus sollicitus fuisse cencendus est.

a Epist. 3.

b Pro 11. 22

Our Lordly Prelates have only one more *rotten prop* left them, to support their pretended *Divine Right* over other Ministers, which having relation to *Timothy* and his Episcopacy, I shall briefly undermine, subvert, and turn upon them to their overthrow.

They pretend and contend with all their might, *That the Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus*, to whom St. *John* writ his Epistle, *Rev.* 2. 1, 2. was a Bishop, superior in power and Jurisdiction to other Ministers, by Divine Institution; because he writes only in the singular number to him, and stiles him the *Angel* (not *Angels*) of the Church of *Ephesus*; which implies a superiority of one single Minister over all other Elders or Ministers in that Church, to whom this Epistle is specially directed; as (*a*) Bishop *Hall*, (*b*) Bishop *Usher* (*c*) Sir *Thomas Aston*, and (*d*) others confidently assert.

a *Episcopacy by Divine right. An humble Remonstrance, p. 27 Defence of the Humble Remonstrance, p 103, to 127.*

b *The Iudgement of Dr.* Reynolds, *&c.*

Quest. 3. Whether the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* was a Diocæsan Bishop?

To which I answer, First, that this word, *Angel*, is but a metaphorical Title, proper only to the heavenly Spirits in strictness of Speech, and in a large sence, as it signifies a

more largely confirmed out of Antiquity, by James Vsher *Bishop of* Armagh. c *Brief Relation of Episcopacy, Sect.* 2 *p* 6, 7. d William *Bishop of* Rochester, *Sermon* 1 *at* Hampton *Court* September 21. 1605. George Downham *his Sermon on Apoc.* 1, 20. *and Defence thereof.* London 1611.

* Angelus nomen est officii, non naturæ, &c. Angelus enim Græcè vocabulo, Latinè dicitur nuntius, si quæris nomen naturæ, spiritus est; si officium Angelus: ex eo quod subsistit spiritus est, ex eo quod mittitur Angelus. Hieronymus Explan. in Epist. ad Hebræos, c. 1.

* Messenger, or Servant, it may as aptly denote, a *Minister*, or *Presbyter*, as a *Bishop*. This Title therefore of it self, as it is used by S. *John*, makes nothing for Episcopacy, since ordinary *Presbyters* are in Scripture sometimes styled * *Angels*, but Bishops (distinct from Presbyters) are never so called therein.

Secondly, Our Bishops themselves if not the whole Church of *England* with our late famous King *James* in the Contents annexed by them to the Bibles of the last Translation, now onely used and permitted in our Churches, in expres terms, expound the Angels of the 7. Churches to be the *Ministers* of them, the Contents of the second Chapter of the Revelation running thus, *What is commanded to be written to the* ANGELS, that is, *the* MINISTERS *of the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thiatyra, &c.* Had these Angels been such as you now call Bishops, you would have rendered the Contents thus, *What is written to the Angels*, that is, *to the Bishops of Ephesus, &c.* But since you expound Angels thus, to be the Ministers of these Churches, who in vulgar appellation and acceptation are distinct from Bishops, and as you hold inferior to them; you must now either renounce your own and our Churches exposition, or your Episcopacy: For if the Angels of these Churches be the most Eminent persons and rulers in them, as you argue; and these, as the Contents testifie, be not Bishops but Ministers; it follows infallibly, that ordinary Ministers and Presbyters, are superior to Bishops, not Bishops to them. And that these Angels were the Ministers of these Churches, is evident by the expres resolution of St. *Augustine*, Ep. 132. & Hom. 2. in Apoc. *Gregorius Magnus. Moralium in Job. l. 34. c. 4. Quod dicit Angelo Theatiræ, dicit Prepositis Ecclesiarum, Sæpe sacram Scripturam, Prædicatores Ecclesiæ pro eo, quod Patris gloriam annuciant ANGELORUM nomine solere designare: quod Johannes in Apocalypsi septem Ecclesiis scribens, ANGELIS Ecclesiarum loquitur*, id est, *PRÆDICATORIBUS POPULORUM*; And by the judgement of our own learned *James Pilkington*, late Bishop of *Durham* in his *Exposition upon the Prophet Aggeus*, c. 1. v. 13. *London*, 1562. where he writes thus

* 1 Cor. 1. 1. Rev. 1. 20. c. 2, 8, 12, 18. c. 3. 1, 7, 14.

thus, That more worshipful names are given to the Preaching Minister, than to any sort of men. This name *Angel*, is given to to the Preachers, for the heavenly comfort that they bring to man from God, whose Messengers they be. In the *Revelations* of St. *John*, he writes to the 7. Angels, *i. e.* to the 7. *Ministers* (not Bishops) of the 7. Congregations or Churches in *Asia*. By this Bishops resolution then, these 7. Angels are 7. Preaching Ministers, not Lordly Non-preaching Prelates. And Mr. *Fox* in his *Meditations* on *Apoc.* c. 2. p. 27, 28. concurs with him; averring, That by the seven Angels, is ment either the *Ministers* of the seven Churches, or the Churches themselves; which exposition is as antient as (a) *Aretas*, (b) *Primasius*, and (c) *Ambrosius Anbertus*, who in their Commentaries on *Apocalypsis* write thus. ‘ Septem ‘ stellæ Angeli sunt septem Ecclesiarum. Nec putandum est ‘ quod hoc loco Angeli singuli singulis deputentur homini- ‘ bus, quod incongrue ab aliquibus æstimatur, sed potius ‘ Angeli Ecclesiæ hic intelligendi sunt rectores populi, qui ‘ singulis Ecclesiis, præsidentes, verbum ritè cunctis annun- ‘ ciant. Nam & Angeli nomen, nuncius interpretatum ‘ dicitur. Et Angelo Ecclesiæ Ephesi scribe. Dativo hic ‘ casu Angelo posuit, non Genitivo. Ac si diceret, Scribe ‘ Angelo huic Ecclesiæ, ut non tam Angelum & Ecclesiam ‘ separatim videratur dixisse, quam quis Angelus exponere ‘ voluisset, unam videlicet faciens Angeli Ecclesiæque per- ‘ sonam. Quamvis enim Sacramenti dispensatione præpo- ‘ natur, compaginis tamen unitate connectitur. Nam hanc ‘ regulam a principio servans, non septem Angelis, sed sep- ‘ tem Ecclesiis scripsisset; Johannes inquiens, *Septem Eccle- ‘ siis quæ sunt in Asia*, & Dominus quem vidit; *Scribe*, inquit, ‘ *in libro quæ vidisti, & mitte septem Ecclesiis*. Postea tamen ‘ Angelis jubet scribi, ut ostenderet, unum esse. Sed etiam ‘ si qua singulis partiliter Ecclesiis prædicat, universam ge- ‘ neraliter convenire docetur Ecclesiam. Neque enim di- ‘ cit, Quid spiritus dicat Ecclesiæ, sed Ecclesiis. Angelum ‘ ergo Ecclesiam significans, duas in eo partes ostendit, ‘ dum & laudat & increpat. In consequentibus autem ‘ manifestatur non eandem increpare quam laudat, sic ut,

(a) Lib. 1 c. 1, 2.

(b) In Apoc. c. 2. Bibl. Patrum. Tom 6. pars 1. p. 523

(c) Lib. 2. in Apoc.

Domi-

‹Dominus in Evangelio omne præpositorum corpus, *unum ‹servum dixit beatum & nequam, quem veniens Domi- ‹nus ipse dividet, & non tantum servum sed partem, in- ‹quit, ejus cum Hypocritis ponet: Yea, *Ludovicus ab Al-caſar*, a late Jesuite in his *Commentary on the Apocalyps*. Antuerp 1614. *Proem.* in c. 2. R. 3. *Notatio.* 1. p. 250, 251. writes, That *Andreas, Aretas, Ansbertus, Anſelmus, Pererius, Victorinus, Ticinius, Ambroſius, Haymo & Beda* are of this opinion. *Angelorum & ſtellarum nomine deſignari Eccleſias ipſas: that by the name of Angels the Churches themſelves are ſignified*; not the Lordly Prelates in them, not one antient Commentator on this Chapter that I find, and few modern expounding these Angels to be Diocæsan Bishops, as our Prelates, against all sense, will make them; yea, *Andreas Cæsarienſis, Comment. in Joan.* Apoc. c. 3. p. 8. writes, *Probabile ſit per 7. Angelos, totius univerſi gubernationem, quæ in dextera Chriſti, ſicut omnes quoquæ terræ fines, ſita eſt, hoc loco ſignificari.* Since then by Angels is here meant, either the Ministers of the Church of *Ephesus*, or the whole Church it self, or Christs Government over the Universe, as these Authors averre; this Text makes nothing at all for our Lordly Prelates Hierarchy over Presbyters.

‹Thirdly, It is observable that Saint *John* neither in his Gospel nor Epistles, nor in his book of the *Revelation*, doth so much as once use the name or word Bishop, but the name of *Elder*, or *Presbyter* very often, both in his *Epistles*, and in the *Apocalyps*. I then appeal to any reasonable Creature, whether it is not more probable, that Saint *John* by this word Angel, should rather mean the *Elders or Presbyters of those Churches*; (a Title which he gives himself, 2 *John* 1. 3 *John* 1.) and which Title and Office he so (*a*) frequently mentions in the 4, 5, 7. and other Chapters of the *Apocalyps* next ensuing, than the Lordly Bishops of those Churches superior to, or distinct from Presbyters, whose office (for ought appears) he never knew, and whose Title he never useth in his writings?

Fourthly, It is remarkable, that St. *John* doth ever place the 24. *Elders sitting on so many seats, next unto the Throne*

*Luk 12. Mat 24

† See *Gerſomus Bucerus de Gubern Eccleſiæ* p 205, 393, 408, 419, 422, 433. *Smectymnuus, Anſwer to an Humble Remonſtrance* p 52, to 59.

a Rev 4: 10 c 5. 5, 8, 11, 14 c 7. 11, 13. c 11. 16. c 19 4. c 14. 3.

Throne of Christ himself; and the Angels standing farther off from the Throne without the Elders. If then by the Elders (as is generally agreed by all) be meant the Presbyters or Ministers of the Church, and by Angels, as you pretend, be meant Bishops; then the Presbyters must needs be more honorable by divine institution then the Bishops. First, because they are (*a*) next the Throne of Christ. Secondly, because *they* (*b*) *sit on seats or chairs, round about his Throne, and before God*, clothed in white rayment, whiles the Angels (*c*) stand about them. Thirdly, because these Elders are still introduced by St. *John* in this book, (d) *Worshiping and adoring God and Christ, and giving thanks honour, praise, and glory unto them*; Fourthly, because they only are said to have (*e*) *Crowns of Gold on their heads*, (the badge of Soveraignty and Superiority) *and* (f) *harps and golden Vials in their hands, full of Odours, which are the Prayers of Saints*; Fifthly, *because they* (g) *sing the new Song*; And among other passages prayse Christ for this in special manner, *Rev.* 5. 10. *And hast made VS* (not Bishops) *unto our God KINGS and PRIESTS, and we shall reign on the earth.* Therefore Presbyters doubtless are the chief and principal Ministers in the Church of Christ by divine institution; and being thus made Kings and Priests, and adorned with crowns, to the end that they may reign upon the earth; no Prelates or Lord Bishops ought to rule over them, or climb Paramount them, as they do. Sixthly, because these Elders not Bishops informed St. *John* himself and instructed him in the things he doubted of, *Revel.* 5. 4, 5. c. 7. 13, 14, 15, 17. Therefore these Elders, must certainly be the better, the most eminent Scient men, and so Paramount the Angel-Bishops in all these respects.

a *Rev* 4. 4 c 11. 16
b *Rev* 7. 11
c *Rev* 4. 10, 11 c 5. 8, 9 c 11. 16, 17, 18.
c *Rev* 4. 6, 10.
d *Rev* 5. 8, 9.
e *Rev* 5 9

Fifthly, Though the Angel be here named in the singular number, yet the Elders are still mentioned in the Plural. And as for the Church of *Ephesus* in those days, it is most certain by *Act.* 20. 27, 28. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Rev.* 1. 20. That there were divers Elders, of *equal authority ruling in it*, whom the Holy Ghost expressly not only called, but *made Bishops and Overseers of that Church, both to Rule and Feed it.* To make

there-

therefore one Bishop and Superintendent in this Church superiour to all the rest, and he only graced with the name of an *Angel*, is but a crazie conceipt of a proud Episcopal brain, contrary to apparent Texts.

Sixthly. This Angel is not said to have any Jurisdiction or Superiority over other Ministers or Presbyters in the Church of *Ephesus*, nor to be supreme or general Superintendent Prelate of that Church, neither is there any thing spoken of him with reference to any other Minister of *Ephesus*. What then can this poor Title make for Episcopal Priority and Jurisdiction? The Spirit writes to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*; Ergo this Angel was a Bishop, and superiour to all other Ministers of *Ephesus*, is a strange *non-sequiter*, and yet this is all this Text affords our Bishops.

Seaventhly, Bishop *Hall* and other Contenders for Episcopacy, grant that there were divers particular Churches and Congregations in and about *Ephesus*, every one of which had its several Minister or Presbyter to instruct them; else they could prove no Episcopacy or Diocæsan Superintendency from one particular Congregation. This being granted by him and his party: Let them then tell me seriously, whether this Angel, which they will not have taken collectively and Plurally, for the whole Presbytery and Ministery of that Church, as many ancient and (*a*) modern Commentators expound it, but individually for one particular Person) should not rather be one particular Pastor of one of the Churches of *Ephesus* onely, who had lost his first love, and therefore was worthily reprehended, then a Diocæsan Bishop or Archbishop of that Church to whose jurisdiction all other Presbyters and Bishops of that National Church were subordinate, for which there is no ground in Scripture.

(*a*) *Smectymnuus answer to Bishop Halls Remonstrante, p. 52, to 59.*

Eighthly, our (*b*) Prelates all plead very hard, *That* Timothy *was ordained the first Bishop of* Ephesus, *and dyed Bishop of that See*; which if I admit (though I think untrue) then it is clear, that this *Angel of* Ephesus, *who lost his first love*, was famous and zealous *Timothy*, not dead when this Epistle

(*b*) *Downham, Hall, Vsher, and others.*

was

was written, as * *Pererius*, and * *Alcazar*, both Jesuits, with *Lyra*, *Rybera*, * *P. Hallix* and others confess. And who dares be so presumptuous as to think *Timothy*, a man so eminent, famous, zealous, and so much applauded in Scripture, would prove an Apostate or Backslider, and *lose his first love?* Either therefore you must deny *Timothy*, or this Angel to be the Bishop of this Church.

* In Apoc. in c 1 Disp. 2 Com. in Apoc 1 c 2, v. Not. 1 p 151 where he cites *Lyr.* and Rybera to this effect.

Ninthly, admit this Angel to be a Bishop, yet it was only such a Bishop as was all one and the same with Presbyters, and of which there *were* (a) *many in one Church* (nor one over many Churches) according to the Holy Ghosts and the Apostles own institution; as appears by *Acts* 20. 17, 28. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. compared with 1 *Pet.* 5. 2, 3. *Jam.* 5. 14. *Acts* 14. 23. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. Therefore it maketh nothing for, but directly against that Episcopacy you contend for.

a Cent. Magd. l. 2. c 10 col. 326 Niceph l 3 c 71 Vincent. Spec. Hist l 38 c 10 Fasciculus Temporum.

Tenthly, Grant him such a Bishop as you would make him; yet at the best he was an Apostate, who had fallen *from, and lost his first love*, by being made a Lord Bishop. And it will be but little credit for our Prelates, to found their Hierarchy upon an Apostate: Yea, if I conjecture not amiss, this may be one probable reason, why so many Ministers prove Turn-coats, Apostates, loosing their first love, zeal to God,* and diligence in Preaching, when they are made Lord Bishops, because they have an *Apostate Angel*, both for their foundation, and imitation: Happy men be their dole; let them make the best of this Apostate, I will not hinder, but rather pity them in this folly.

* Queen *Elizabeth* when she made Dr. *Dun* a Bishop, said, *I have marred a good preacher by making him a Bishop.*

Eleventhly, it is very observable, that as (b) *Angels* being all *ministring Spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation*, have little care, and no need at all of temporal Lordships, Manors, or Possessions. So the *Angels* of the Church of God (*whose* (c) *conversations and affections ought wholly to be fixed on Heaven, and Heavenly things, not on Earth, or Earthly things*, and to make it their onely imployment to instruct and save the peoples souls committed to their charge, *Acts* 20. 22, to 30.) have little or no desire, use, or need at all of *Lordly Palaces, Mannors, Lordships, Great temporal*

b Heb. 1. 14.

c Col. 3. 1, 2, 3. Phil. 3. 8, 20, 21. 1 John 2. 15

Possessions, Revenues, or Pontifical Miters, Crosiers, Rochets, Vestments; and indeed the *Angels* of the Church of *Ephesus*, and the other Churches of *Asia*, for ought appears, had no such Palaces, Temporalities, Lands, Miters, or Pontifical Vestments belonging to them, as their Successors now claim, covet, enjoy, use, and most eagerly contend for: neither had the Primitive best and holiest Bishops, for above 300 years after Christ, any such Temporal Possessions or Accouterments. Yea, (a) *Johannis Parisiensis*, (b) *Polychronicon*, (c) *Nauclerus* (d) *Wickliff*, the (e) Lord *Cobham*, (f) *John Frith*, (both Martyrs for Religion) Bishop (g) *Jewel*, (h) *Thomas Beacon*, and the last Translators of the *English Bible*, in their Epistle prefixed thereunto, unanimously record, *That when the Emperour* Constantine *the great, endowed the Bishops and Church with temporal Lands and Possessions*, the voyce of AN ANGEL *was heard in the ayr, crying out thus against it*, HODIE VENENUM INFUNDITUR IN ECCLESIAM; This day IS POYSON poured into *the Church of God: And from that time* (these Authors observe) *because of the great riches the Church and Bishops had, they were made the more Secular, and had more worldly business then spiritual Devition, and more pomp and boast outward, then holiness inward.* Whence grew this common Proverb, *Ecclesia peperit divitias, & filia devoravit matrem*, The Church hath begotten riches, and the daughter hath devoured the mother; there being usually the least real Piety and Religion in Churches and Churchmen, where there is greatest Wealth and Temporal Possession. Upon which consideration our famous English Apostle (i) *John Wickliff*, and his followers, together with our three Martyrs, (k) *William Swinderby*, *John Purvie*, and Sir *John Old-Castle*, publikely maintained, *That the King and Temporal Lords grievously sinned in endowing the Bishops with ample temporal Possessions; which had reversed Christs Ordinances, and procreated Antichrist*: and THAT THEY WERE BOUND IN CONSCIENCE *to take away their Lands and Temporalties from them, which they had abused to pride, ambition, luxury, discord: And that the Commons ought not to be burdened with*

Taxes,

a *De Vtraque Potestate, c. 21.*
b *Hist. l. 4. c. 26.*
c *Chronicon in vita Sylvestri.*
d *Dialogorum l. 4. c. 15, 16, 17, 25.*
e Fox Acts & Mon. p. 517, 521.
f Answer to the preface of Mr. *Moors* book, p. 161.
g Sermon on Hag. 1. p. 176 defence of the Apology, part 6. c. 9. divis. 3.
h Reports of certain men, vol. 3. p. 341.
i *Dialogorum l. 4. c. 15, 16, 17, 18, 26, 27. Walsingham Hist. Angl. p. 302, to 307 Henry de Knyghton de Eventibus Angl. l. 5*
k *Fox Acts and Mon. p. 368, 414, 431, 434.*

Taxes, as long as the Church had any Patrimony left, which was given only by ways of almes, to relieve the people in their poverty. Yea since these godly Martyrs, *Hooper* Bishop of *Gloecester*, (Martyred in Queen *Maries* reign) in his Commentary upon the 8. Commandement, p. 76. writes expresly, *The Primitive Church had no such Bishops as we, they had such Bishops as did preach many godly Sermons in less time then our Bishops horses be a brideling. The Magistrates that suffer the abuse of these goods be guilty of the fault.* IF THE FOURTH PART OF THE BISHOPRICK REMAINED TO THE BISHOP IT WERE SUFFICIENT; *the third to Schoolmasters, the second to Poor, and* SOULDIERS, WERE BETTER BESTOWED. *If any be offended with me for this my saying, he loveth not his own health, nor Gods Laws nor mans, out of which I am always ready to prove the thing I have said to be true*: So this Martyred Bishop, whom (a) Mr. *Elmer* (afterwards Bishop of *London*) thus seconds. *Come off ye Bishops, away with your superfluites,* YIELD UP YOUR THOUSANDS, BE CONTENT WITH HUNDREDS, AS THEY BE IN OTHER REFORMED CHURCHES, *where there are as great learned men as you are.* LET YOUR PORTION BE PRIESTLIKE, NOT PRINCELIKE, LET THE QUEEN HAVE THE REST OF YOUR TEMPORALTIES TO MAINTAIN WARS (and why not the King and Kingdoms now?) *and to build Schools throughout the Realm, that every Parish Church may have its Preacher, every City her Superintendent, to live not Pompously,* WHICH WILL NEVER BE UNLESS YOUR POSSESSIONS BE DISPOSED AND BESTOWED UPON MANY, WHICH NOW FEED AND FAT BUT ONE, &c. If any of our Prelates deem it Sacriledge for *Kings and People to make use of the Treasures, Lands and Revenues of the Church and Bishops in times of War*, let them peruse the 1 *Kings* 14. 26. 2 *Kings* 14. 8. c. 24. 13. 2 Chron. 12. 9. c. 25. 24. c. 36. 18. *Ezra* 1. 7, 8. and learned *Hugo Grotius* (whom (b) *Episcopal Diviner* much admire as well as most Lawyers and Statesmen) *De Jure Belli*, l. 3. c. 5. & *Annotata*, where he proves at large by many Presidents; *that as Wars make all sacred things, yea Temples and Churches themselves and their ornaments pro-*

Nota.

a Harbour for faithful Subjects Printed at Strasburg.

b Dr. Hamond in his Annotations on the New Testament.

phane and common to the Conquerors, and wholly to be at their absolute disposal as *Deut.* 7. 5, 6. c. 12. 2, 3. 30, 31. *Judg.* 2. 2. *Psal.* 79. 1. 2 *Chron.* 36. 18. *Psal.* 74. 7, 8, 9. *Psal.* 83. 12. compared with the forecited Texts, *Theodoret* Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 10, 11, 12. and all ages evidence; So, *Populus ipse matata voluntate, potest ex sacro prophanum facere, and imploy those Lands and Treasures in the* * *Wars which they had formerly consecrated unto God*, whereof we have many Presidents in our own and forein Histories. All which considered, if our Bishops will be like the Angels in these Primitive Churches of *Asia* and *Ephesus*, they must quit all their large Temporal Lands and Possessions * to the King, from whom they received them, and who always enjoyed them during the vacancies of their Sees in the right of the Crown, from whom they were derived, to defray the publick expences of the Kingdom in those times of need. Most Honors, Manors, Lands, Tenements, Possessions, now belonging to our Kings, Nobles, Gentry, Commonalty, Universities, Colledges, Hospitals, at some time or other being given to Abbys, Priories, Chantries, Nunneries, Archbishopricks, Bishopricks, Deans, Chapters or other Churches, Church-men and Religious houses, yet resumed, alienated, sold, or taken from them, as *Ingulphus Beda, William Thorn*, his Chronicle & *Evidentiæ Ecclesiæ christi cant. Malmesbury, Monasticon Anglicanum*, and our Charters, Law books, Records abundantly evidence, and are still retained without any scruple or danger of Sacriledg: And truely were all Appropriations, and impropriations now belonging to Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters (amounting at this day to above fifty thousand pounds a year) made presentable, and the Deans and Chapters Lands imployed in purchasing in all impropriations belonging to Colledges, Hospitals, Freeschools, Corporations and Gentlemen, to make them presentable for the benefit of the peoples souls and bodies, according to their true original intention and donation; The Clergy of *England* would enjoy a far better, properer Patrimony and Maintenance, equally distributed between them, than all their Temporalities and Spiritualities put together, do now amount unto, of which a few

* Much more then in this late War, which some Bishops stiled *BELLUM EPISCOPALE.*

* See my seasonable Vindication of the Supreame Invisdiction of Christian Kings, Lords, Parliaments, as well over the Possessions as Persons of Delinquents, Prelates. 1660.

few Lazie, non-preaching or rare-preaching Prelates, Deans, Prebends and their Farmers, (who starves the peoples souls) now reap the greatest benefit. But of this no more at present.

Twelfly, (Whatever (*a*) *Dionysius* and others fancy to the contrary, of the different orders and degrees among *Angels*) it is evident beyond contradiction, by all the Marginal (*b*) *Texts* of Scripture, that the *Angels of God are all equal in order, power, dignity, office, degree, Ministry*, none of them exercising any Dominion, Jurisdiction or Authority over another Angel, much less such Lordly power or authority, as our Archbishops and Bishops claim or use over other Ministers; And as that of Christ himself, *Luk.* 20.36. *Neither can they die any more*, for THEY ARE EQUAL UNTO THE ANGELS, *and are the children of God, and of the Resurrection*; proves an equallity or parity among the *Angels* themselves; and between Saints and Angels after the Resurrection: so these words of the *Angel* himself to St. *John* (*c*) an ELDER) *when he fell down at his feet to worship him*, Rev. 19. 10. c 20. 9. *see thou do it not, for I AM THY FELLOW-SERVANT, and of THY BRETHREN THE PROPHETS, worship God*, resolve; That *Angels* and *Elders* are *Fellow-Servants* and Equals, and therefore no adoration or worship is to be rendered by one of them to the other, Which compared with *Mat.* 18. 28, to 34: c. 24. 49. Col, 1. 7. c. 4. 7, 10. 2 Cor. 8. 29. Phil. 1. 23. 2 Thes. 3. 2, 3. John 8. Rev. 6. 11. (styling all *Evangelists, Ministers and Preachers of the Gospel, Fellow-servants, Fellow-workers, Fellow-helpers, &c.*) are an unanswerable evidence of the *Parity, Equality* of all *Angels, Elders, Ministers*, Bishops by Divine institution; and utterly subverts the pretended Divine Lordly Hierarchy, Jurisdiction, and Superiority of Bishops over Ministers, from the Angels of the 7. Churches, sounded in *Rev.* 1. 20. & c. 2. 1. As for the supposed Superiority and Authority of Bishops over other Elders and Ministers in the Primitive Church for 300. years or more after the Apostles, it was no other, no greater then the (*d*) Presidents in general, or national Councils, over the Councils themselves, and their respective Members; or of Prolocutors

a *De Cœlesti Hierarchia*

b *Ps* 8. 5 *Ps* 91. 11 *Psa* 103. 4. *Psa* 102. 4 *Psa* 14[illegible]. 2 *Mat* 4. 12 c 13 39, 49 c 18 10 c 24. 3 c 25. 36 *Mat* 8. 38 *Luk* 2. 15 c 12. 18. *l* 15. 10 c 16. 22 c 20. 36. *Rom* 8. 8 1 *Cor* 4. 9 c 20. 36 c 6. 3 2 *Thes* 1. 7 *Tim* 3. 16. c 5. 21 *Hebr.* 4, 5, 13, 14 c 2, 2, 6 c 12. 22 1 *Pet* 1. 12 c 3. 22 2 *Pet* 1. 11 *Jud.* 6 *Rev* 5 11 c 3 5 c 7 1 c 8. 2 c 12. 3 c 2 *John* 3. 3 *John* 1

d *Quid est enim Episcopus nisi primus Presbyter? &c. Augustin, quæst. ex utroque Test. mixtim qu.* 100. *See Gersomus Bucerus de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ: David Blondelli Apolog. pro sententia Hieronymi, de Episcopis & Presbyteris, Mr. Rutherfords due Right of Presbyteries*

cutors in our Convocations, of Speakers of the Lords or Commons Houses in Parliaments, of Chair-men in respective Committees, of Judges or Justices of Peace, who give the Charge or Judgement at Assises or Quarter Sessions, of Foremen of Grand-Juries, and Petty Juries, over the rest of the Convocations, Lords, Commons, Committees, Judges, Justices, and Jury-men; being nothing else but a priority of *order, session, place, nomination, or direction*, not of Jurisdiction, Power of Degree, for which there is no ground in Scripture or Antiquity.

Finally, I shall desire all Presbyters, and others, to take special notice, that as Popes and Lordly Prelates, to maintain their pretended Divine Superiority over their fellow Presbyters and Ministers, have sacrilegiously robbed them of the Sacred Titles of *Bishops* and *Angels* of the Church, appropriating them wholly to themselves, against the express letter of the Gospel, and practice of the purest primitive Churches, which equally attributed them to all Presbyters and Ministers of the Gospel. So on the other hand, they have most injuriously deprived all lay-Christians of sundry Titles given to, and purchased for them by God himself, and Jesus Christ, against the express letter of the Gospel, and monopolized them to themselves alone, on purpose to discriminate themselves from, and advance themselves above all lay-Christians, how holy, gracious, or great soever, and to exempt their Persons, Possessions, Estates and Ecclesiastical proceedings, from the jurisdiction, power, seisure of all Christian Kings, Princes, Magistrates, and lay-Christians whatsoever. I shall instance onely in some few particulars:

1. They have engrossed, appropriated to themselves alone, the Name and Title of THE CHURCH, or (*a*) HOLY CHURCH; and by consequence, of *Ecclesiastical Persons* or *Church-men*, in contradistinction, to and discrimination of themselves from all Lay Christians and Believers; who by no means must be either stiled or reputed *the Church*, or *Ecclesiastical Persons*, or *Church-men*, as if they were meer Pagans, and no parts nor members of the Church of Christ.

(*a*) See *Magna Charta* c. 1. and other statutes in time of Popery, Bellarm. de Eccles. & Cler. Espencæus, digres. in 1 Tim. 1, c. 3, 2, & 6.

An

An (b) *Antichristian* stratagem of *Popes*, and *Popish Prelates* onely at first, but since made use of by most Protestant Bishops, and Prelatical Clergy-men, to the apparent injury of all lay-Christians; who are not onely frequently stiled, *the Church, Churches, Temple of God, of Christ, and the Holy Ghost*, as distinct from Apostles, Prophets, Presbyters, Priests, Pastors and Ministers (never once stiled the *Church* in the Old or New-Testament, as lay-Christians frequently are; but onely the Elders, Messengers, Servants, Angels, Pastors, Bishops, Overseers, Watchmen of the Church and Flock of Christ;) but are likewise ever conjoyned with the Apostles, Evangelists, Bishops, Ministers, and Pastors of the Church, and really comprized with them under the stile and title of the Church, Assembly, or Congregation, throughout the Old and New Testament, as is undeniably evident by *Exod.* 12.6. *Numb.* 6.9.c.10.2,3. *Deut.* 9.10,c.16.8. 1 *Chron.* 28.1.&c. c.29. 1,10,20,21. 2 *Chron.* 1.2,3,5,6. c. 5. 2,3,4.c.6.3,12, &c.c.7.8,9.c.29.20,&c. c.30. 1. *to* 27. *Ezra* 9. 4,&c.c.10.1. *Psal.* 7.7. *Psal.* 22. 22, 25. *Psal.* 35. 18. *Psal.* 40.9,10. *Psal.* 26. 12. *Psal.* 68. 26. *Psal.* 108. 32. *Psal.* 111. 1. *Psal.* 116. 14, 18,19. *Psal.* 122. 1,2,4. *Psal.* 148.11,12,13. *Psal.* 149.1. *Joel* 2. 15,16, 17. *Isa.* 2.2,3. c. 4. 2. c. 49. 6,7, 21, 22, 23. *Mich.* 4.1,2. *Ezek.* 44. 24. *Nehem.* 5. 13. c. 8.8. *Jer.* 7.3,4. *Mat.* 16. 18. c. 18.17. *Acts* 2. 47. c.5. 11. c.7.38. c.8.1. *to* 9. c.9. 31. c. 10.22,26. c.12. 1,5. c.3.1. c.14. 23,27. c.15. 3, 4,22,41, c.17.5. c. 18.22. c. 19.37. c.20.13,28. *Rom.* 16. 1,4,16,23. 1 *Cor.* 1.2. c. 3. 16, 17. c. 4. 17. c.6. 19. c.7. 17. c.10.32. c.11.16, 17,22, c.14.4,5,23, 28,33,34,35. c. 15.9. c.16.1,19. 2 *Cor.* 1.1. c.6.16. c. 8.1, 18,19,23, 24. c.11. 8, 28.c.12.14. *Gal.* 1.2,12, 13,22. *Ephes.* 1.12.c.3.10,21. c.5.23. to 33. *Phil.* 1.1,2.c.3.6.c.4.15. *Col.* 1.18,24.c.4.15,16.1 *Thess.* 1.1,2,14.2 *Thess.* 1.1,4. 1 *Tim.* 3.1,5. c.5.16. *Phil.* 2. *Heb.* 2. 12. c. 10.25. c. 12.22,23. *James* 2. 2. c.5. 14. 1 *Pet.* 5.5. 3 *John* 6.9,10. *Rev.* 1.4,11, 20, c. 2. 1,7,8,12,17,18,23. c. 3. 1,6,7,13,14,22,23, c. 22.16. and other Scriptures compared together. Hence c *Tertullian* within two hundred years after Christ, resolved, *Sed & ubi tres ECCLESIA EST LICET LAICI*; which he grounded on *Mat.* 18.20. Yea, the very

b Mr. William Tyndal, what the Church is, and his practice of Popish Prelates

c Exhort. ad Castitat. tom. p 171.

very Gloss on Gratian. Occham. Dialog. l. 5. sect. 1. c. 32. Angelus de Clavasio, Summa Angelica, Tit. Ecclesia, Alex. Alensis, part. 3. p. 282. Panormitan. De Electiones & Electi Potestate, c. significasti, Durandus Rationale Divin. l. 6. c. 7. 23, 25. Canus, l. 4. c. 5. Cameracensis, quæst. Vespert. de Resumpta, Æneas Silvius, de Gestis Concilii Basil. p. 4. Turricremata, de Consecrat distinct. 2. semel in. 4. & sum. de Ecclesia, l. 3. c. 6. which other Popish Canonists, Schoolmen, Writers assert, (b) that *Tempore mortis Christi, REMANSIT ECCLESIA IN SOLA VIRGINE MARIA*; That at the time of Christs death (when some of his Disciples denied him, (c) *and all of them forsook him and fled*) the Church remained in the Virgin *MARY* alone, though but a single person, and neither an Apostle, Bishop, Presbyter, nor yet capable of holy Orders, but a meer lay-person. To which I shall subjoyn this further consideration, That the 20 Article of the Church of *England*, *John Wickliff*, Mr *William Tyndal*, Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Ally*, Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Usher*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Fulke*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *John Reynolds*, Dr. *John White*, Dr. *Ames*, and all other Divines who have written of the Church; the Confessions of all the Reformed Churches collected in the Harmony of Confessions, sect. 10. *Amseculus*, *Peter Martyr*, *Bucer*, *Calvin*, *Melanction*, *Chemitius*, *Mornay*, *Oecolampadius*, *Hus*, *Chamier*, *Cameron*, and others, in their discourses of the Church, together with *Peter Lambard*, *Aquinas*, *Alensis*, *Media*, *Villa*, *Canus*, *Bellarmine*, *Angelus de Clavasio*, and other Popish Schoolmen and Canonists, who have written, *De Ecclesia*, though they dissent in other particulars, do yet all generally accord in these two distinctions and definitions of the Church.

b See Dr. Field of the Church, l. 1. c. 6

c Mat. 26, 56, Mar. 14. 50

1. *That the Catholick Church of Christ, is the universal company of Gods Elect, whose Names are written in Heaven.*

2. *That the true militant Church of Christ, whether Oecumenical, National, particular or congregational, is an assembly or congregation of believers, exetrnally professing the true Christian Religion, wherein the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments are duly administred according to Christs institution.*

Neither

Neither of which definitions is peculiar, or applicable either to the Pope, *Bishops, Presbyters or Clergy, considered singly by themselves, without the Laity, but are applicable only to the Laity and Clergie joyntly, as elect, or professing the faith of Jesus Christ, without discrimination of calling, sex, age, profession, or degrees; who are all as properly, truly Church-men, and members of the Church and of Jesus Christ, though laymen, women, children, as the greatest Popes, Archbishops, Bishops, Presbyters, Deans, or other Ecclesiastical persons whatsoever; who upon these considerations must quit their Papal Monopoly and Appropriation of the Title of, *The Church*, *Church-men* and Ecclesiastical persons to themselves alone, to the injury of all Lay-Christians.

* *Soli Episcopi non constituunt Ecclesiam, Ecclesia representativa nec solet nec propre est Ecclesia Gish. Vos tuo, Desp. causa Papatus l. 3. Sect. 2. p. 636.*

2. They have appropriated to themselves alone, the Titles and Names of *Priests*, of *Spiritual-men*, and *Persons*, when as the Scripture expresly communicates and gives these titles to all true Christians and Believers, though not in Orders, *Exod.* 19.6. 1 *Pet.* 2.5. *Rev.* 1.5,6. c.5.10. c. 20.6. 1 *Cor.* 2.15. c.3.1. c.14.37. *Gal.* 6.1. Whence (a) *Tertullian* argues thus, *Vani erimus si putaverimus, quod sacerdotibus non liceat Laicis licere, NONNE ET LAICI SACERDOTES SUMUS? Scriptum est, Nos & sacerdotes Deo & Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem & Plebem instituit Ecclesiæ autoritas. Ideo si habeas jus sacerdotis in temetipso, ubi necesse est habeas oportet etiam Disciplinam sacerdotis necesse sit habere jus sacerdotis.*

a *Exhortatio ad Castitatem*, p. 179, 180.

3. They monopolize and appropriate to themselves the Names and Titles of the *Clergy*, or *Clergy-men*, as if they onely were Gods portion and inheritance, as the words κλῆρος, *Clerus* and *Clericus* (signifying Gods portion or inheritance, as *Harmar*, *Holioke*, *Calepine*, *Calvin*, and others, in their Lexicons and Dictionaries, as well as the Greek Fathers and Divines assert;) when as the Scripture expresly resolves, that all *Gods people* are his *portion*, *heritage*, and *inheritance*, and God their portion and inheritance too, as well as Bishops Ministers and Persons in holy Orders, Exod. 34.9. Deut. 32.9. Psal. 16.5. Psal. 73.26. Psal. 119.57. Psal. 142.5. Jer. 10.16. c.12.7,8,9, 10. c. 50. c.1.51.19. Lam. 3.24. Ezek. 2.12. 1 Pet. 5.3. Deut. 9.26,29. c. 32.2. 1 Sam. 10.1. c. 26.19. 2 Sam. 14.

b *Espencæus, Digress. in 1 Tim. l. 1. c. 3. de Clericis & Laicis. Summa Angelica. Tit. cler. Bellarm. de cleril. 1.*

16. c. 21. 3. 1 Kings 8. 51. 53. 2 Kings 21. 14. Psal. 28. 9. Psal. 33. 12. Psal. 74. 2. Psal. 78. 62. Psal. 94. 14. Psal. 106. 5. Isa. 63. 17. Eph. 1. 11, 18. Col. 1. 12.)

4. They have ingrossed and usurped to themselves the Titles of *Sacred, consecrated, holy persons, and Gods anointed ones*; whereas all true Christians and believers whatsoever, are sacred, consecrated, holy persons, Saints, and Gods anointed ones, by their *Baptism, Vocation, Adoption, dedication of themselves to God and his service, internal Unction, and spiritual Regeneration*, as much, as well as the holiest *Bishops, Prelates, Cathedral-men, Ministers*, and other Ecclesiastical persons whatsoever, as the Scriptures and their very name of (a) *Christians* expressly resolve, witness Psal. 105. 13, 14, 15. 2 Chron. 16. 21, 22. Isa. 10. 17. 1 Joh. 1. 3. c. 2. 27. 2 Cor. 1, 21. Exod 19. 6. Deut. 7. 6. c. 26. 19. c. 28. 9. Isa. 62. 12. Dan. 8. 24. 1 Pet. 2. 9. 1 Thess. 5. 27. 2 Tim. 1. 9. Heb. 3. 1. 1 Pet. 1, 15. 2 Pet. 3. 11. 1 Cor. 3, 17. c. 7. 34. Ephes. 1. 1, 4, 15, 18. c. 5. 27, 28. Col. 1. 22. c. 3. 12. 1 Cor. 1. 2. Rom. 1. 7. c. 12. 1. c. 16. 15 Phil. 1. 1. Col. 1. 2, 4, 15, 26. Rev. 20. 9. Phil. 1. 1 5. 7. Having thus injuriously monopolized all these titles to themselves alone, which are common with them to all other Christians, though not in sacred Orders, they have thereupon proceeded and presumed to define, the taking away and alienating of any of their Lands, Goods Tenements, upon any publique or just occasion, yea the seising, arresting, or imprisonment of their persons, the violation of any of their Canons or Priviledges, to be * SACRILEDGE; as if their Persons, Lands, Goods, Priviledges, Functions, and all appurtenances belonging to them were onely sacred and holy, or far more sacred then all other Christians not in Orders, how holy, gracious or pious soever, who are in all respects as really the Church and Temple of God, members of Christs Church and Body, Church-men, Ecclesiastical, Spiritual men, Priests, Sacred, Consecrated, holy Persons, Saints. Clergy-men, Gods portion, inheritance, anointed, dedicated and devoted ones, as the greatest, holiest Popes, Prelates, Ministers and Ecclesiasticks whatsoever, as the forecited Texts resolve, past all contradiction. Which popish gross [illegible] Monopoly,

(a) Acts 11. 26. 26. 28. 1 Pet. 4. 16. compared with 1 Cor. 12. 12, where the Church is called *Christ*, in respect of its *spiritual anointing*.

* See Hostiensis summa Angelica & Rosella Tit. Sacrilegium.

of Iniquity, I thought meet here briefly to detect, to undeceive the people in the point of pretended Sacriledges, wherewith the World hath been heretofore, and now so much cheated and abused by Bishops and Cathedral-men, to support their own Lordly pomp and jurisdiction, both over Presbyters, and all Lay-Christians whatsoever, as well Kings, and Civil Magistrates themselves, as others of inferiour condition; who will now be no longer blinded, cheated, with such Episcopal Impostures, which are as properly and truly SACRILEDGE, in robbing all lay-men of those spiritual titles, priviledges, inheritances which Christ himself hath purchased for, and bequeathed to them, as Popes or Popish Bishops and Priests depriving the Laity of the consecrated Cup in the Lords Supper (to advance themselves above the Laity) which Pope (a) *Gelasius* himself hath long since resolved to be *Grand Sacriledge*, as well as (b) *Protestant Writers* of later times.

a *Divisio unius, ejusdemque mysterii sine* GRANDI SACRILEGIO *non potest provenire Gratiam de consecrationis. Distinct.* [illegible]

b See Dr. *Featlies* Grand Sacriledge of the Church of *Rome*.

I shall close up this dispute with the words of learned *Samuel Bochartus*, in his (c) Epistle to Dr. *Morley*, then his Majestie, Chaplain, and now a Bishop, *Cadomi*. 4. *Mart*. 1650. *Quæstio de Episcopatu & Presbyteratu, quam primo loco ut gravissimum proposuisse videri possis, meo judicio est levissima. Et dissidium ea de re natum videtur nullo negotio posse conciliari, modo absit studium partium; quod in insula vestra* (Angliæ) *plerosque abripit ita transversos, ut magna animorum contentione de hoc solo disputent tanquam pro aris & focis, ac si in eo sita sit Religionis prora & puppis. At nos putamus parum referre, utrum ab Episcopis an a Presbyteris gubernetur Ecclesia, modo graviter & fideliter obeant munus suum quiqui tandem ad clavum sedeant. Si de antiquitate res est, cum Hieronymo plane sentio*; Apostolorum ætate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nihil fuisse discriminis, & communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesias fuisse administratas, ITAQUE PRESBYTERI EPISCOPIS OMNINO SUNT ANTIQUIORES, &c. *In Ecclesia, quidam Episcopali regimini sic assuerunt, ut eo carere nefas putent. Alii Presbyterale regimen Episcopali præferunt; vel quia sub eo nati sunt, vel quia Episcopalem* προστασίαν *experti sunt nimio turgere fastu & in* δεσποτικὸν *& tyrannicum Imperium degenerasse*, HIC IGITUR OPUS EST MUTUA TOLERANTIA: *Et si qua Nobilium*

c *Printed Paris*, 1650. p. 6, 7. l. 10.

vel plebis pars notabilis ad Episcopale regimen summis votis adspirat, author essem ut tam illis permitterentur Episcopi, QUAM PRESBYTERI ALIIS QUI EPISCOPALI JUGO ABHORRENT: *Et communi non Pastorum modo, sed & populorum suffragio in singulis Provinciis res hæc transigeretur. Quod si verum est Episcopos lapsu temporum multa Usurpasse perperam quæ non fuerunt in usu apud veteres, unde factum sit ut hæc potestas merito piis sit exosa & terribilis, quid ni Tenedia bipenni resecare posset Synodus* περαβλασήματα *& ad purioris Ecclesiæ normam sic attemperare, ut non supersit amplius legitimus querelæ locus? Recte observat vir doctissimus; in Episcopatu tria esse quæ non sunt confundenda,* πρεσβυτέριον, *seu Pastorale munus, quod Episcopis Scriptura tribuit:* ἀπόχλω, *sive eminentiam in reliquos Pastores, quam illis concessit ecclesia vetus: & Dominatum in Domini cleros, quem in hæc sæculorum fæce nonnulli proterui sibi arrogarunt. Proinde, primum esse Divini juris; secundum ecclesiastici; tertium vero nullius, & meram usurpationem. Adeoque ecclesiam primo carere non posse; secundum posse ferri:* TERTIUM PLANE ESSE ABOLENDUM. *At propter abusum, usum tolli necesse non est, donec emendationis spes plane decollaverit.*

Having thus through Gods assistance, briefly, clearly, and I hope irrefragably subverted the three main Pillars of our Lordly Bishops divine right of Superiority over other Ministers, and sole power of Ordination by Evangelical institution, (which * *Bishop Hall asserts to be so inseparable to Episcopacy, that he would fain see where it can be shewed, That* * *any extremity of necessity was ever acknowledged a warrant sufficient to others to ordain;*) I cannot but fore-see their near approaching downfal, unless they will henceforth renounce their pretended Papal claim of Episcopal Jurisdiction by a *Divine Title*, and betake themselves wholy and solely to the Kings Grace; deriving all their *superior Jurisdiction in and over all other Ecclesiastical persons and causes only from the Kings special Grants and Commissions*, and exercising it in his Royal name, style, right and authority, according to the Statutes of 26. *H.* 8. c. 1. 37. *H.* 8. c. 17. 1 *Ed.* 6. c. 2. 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. 5 *Eliz.* c. 1. 8 *Eliz.* c. 1. and abandon all their injurious incroachments upon our Kings Prerogative

* *Episcopacy by Divine Right part 2. p. 91*

* See here, p. 82, 83, 86. Postscript, p. 37, 38, &c.

rogative, the Ministers and Peoples just Privileges, Liberties, Consciences; the only means to allay and silence all future controversies of this nature, and to establish Peace and Unity in our Church. And seeing many of them have long since dishonoured and forsaken God, given over or much neglected the constant *preaching of his Word, the chief part* * *of their spiritual functions*, banded themselves against his truth, Ministers, people, and the preaching of his Gospel; which they suppress and put down in all places; yea such is their desperate impiety, that whereas in all former times of Plagues and Pestilence, (yea in ‖ 1 *Jacobi & 1 Caroli*) there hath been by publick authority a special day of fasting, praying, preaching, and humiliation appointed every week, (especially in infected places) to divert Gods heavy judgements, as the *chief antidote against all plagues and judgments*, (a) *prescribed by God himself*; yet now they are grown such open *Fighters against God*, Religion, the Spiritual, Temporal good and safety of the people, that to prevent the Plague, (as they pretend, but in truth to increase it more, and to suppress Preaching, Piety and Religion) they begin to put down all *weekly Lectures, and Lords day Sermons in the Afternoon*, (as if Gods publick Ordinances and Service, the best remedy against, were a means to increase and spread, not stay the Plague;) yea they *debar* (b) *Ministers from using any Prayers at all after their Sermons, or any other Prayer before them, then what the* 55. *Canon prescribes*, in which there is not a word of Prayer against the Plague, Drought, Famine, Sword or Pestilence. By means whereof, and by inhibiting Ministers to reprove the people for their sins, which provoke Gods wrath and judgements at this present, to bring them to repentance for them by their preaching; or to *pray against the plague and other judgments of God, which now lye heavy upon the Kingdom*, and these sins have occasioned; by hindring that publique weekly fasting, preaching, prayer, which God by his *judgments* (c) *now calls for at our hands*; and * countenancing *all prophane Revels, Wakes, Churchales, Maygames, Dancing, Enterludes, Pastimes on the Lords day*; they have made not only the King-

* The Institution of a Christian man, Ch. of Orders and Tho. Bacons Catech. f. 99.

† See the Fastbooks then printed.

a *Ioel* 2. 14, *to* 20, 4. 2. 1, *to* 28 *Isay* 22. 12, 13, 14. 2 *Chron.* 6, *to* 14, *to* 40.

b See Bishop *Wrens* Injunctions for *Norwich*, and his Visitation Articles, yet this Canon binds them not strictly to any form as the Words, Or to this effect, declare.

c Ier 7. 16 c 11, 14 c 14. 11 c 29. 7 c 37 3, 4 c 42. 2. *Ioel* 2. 17 *Isay* 22. 12, 13 * see *Canterburies Doom*, p. 222, to 226, 504, 505, 566, 575, 576.

Kingdom, but themselves especially, ripe for ruine. And being now for these their atheistical godless practises, their enmity to God, his truth, his faithful Ministers and people, their Lordlines, tyranny, pride oppression, worldlyness, prophanes, and irreligion fallen under the very (*d*) *execration of God himself*, and (*e*) the curses of his people *who day and night cry for vengeance against them, as Gods sworn and most professed open enemies*, and having no divine foundation, prop, or Pillar now left, wherewith to support their tottering Thrones and Miters, needs must they shortly, like that (*f*) *High Priest Ely, fall from their high-towring Seats backward, and so break their Necks*, to the joy of all Gods people, whom they now by their persecutions and innovations so much oppress and offend; (*g*) *Even so let all thine enemies perish, O Lord; but let them that love thee, be as the Sun, when it goeth forth in his might.*

d Psal. 9. 21. Judges 5. 23. Mal. 2. 2 c 3. 9
e Luk 18. 7, to 30 Rev 6. 9, 10 Psa 28. 5
f 1 Sam. 4. 18.
g Iudge. 5. 31.

Bern. Homil. 1. *De laudibus Mariæ Virginis* (writ when he was * *pressed to accept*, and yet refused the Bishopricks of *Genoa*, and *Millain*) *Erubesce superbe cinis; Deus se humiliat, tu te exaltas? Deus se hominibus subdit, tu Dominari gestiens tuo te præponis authori. Quotiens hominibus præesse desidero, totiens Deum meum præire contendo, & tunc quæ vere Dei sunt, non sapio.*

* Cl. Espencæus Digres. in 1 Im. l. 3. c. 6.

Gul. Whitakerus Respons. ad Campiani Ration. 10. *Si Episcopum Presbytero æquare sit hæreticum, nihil Catholicum esse potest.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Kind Reader correct these Errors *at the Press.*

IN the Epistles, p 3. l. 10, read *Kings*, p 7 l. 32. r. *crimes*, p. 22. l. 18. *claimed*, p. 25. l. 30. r *and this their full proves*, p. 27, l. 1 l. 7. r. 8 *Elis*. p 30. l 4. into r, *to*, *in*.

In the Margin, p. 2. l. 19. dele *des*. p. 3. l. 7. r. *and subjects liberties*, p. 8. l. 21. r. *Bloudelli*, l. 22. in r. *pro*. l 44. 82. r. 12. p. 9, l. 46. to 932. r. 632. p. 16. l 4. *Sermon*. p. 15. l 3. r. *Hermannum*, l 18. read it, r. *redit*, p. 16. l. 8, 9. r. *Hist of the Sabbath*, p. 18 l. 7. r. *Pralatus*, p. 20. l. 22. ne r. *ut*, p. 25. l. 6. r. 37. H. 8. c. 1^m. p. 29. l. 18, 41. r. l. 4. c, 1 l. 19. dele (*o*)

In the Treatis, p. 16 l. 10 r *examples*, p. 20 l. 20. r *sanskit*, p. 21. l. 12. r. *not so*, twor. *three* p. 33. l. 6. or age r *degree*, p. 31. l 10. r. *excerption*, p. 56. l. 21. r. *and ordination*, p. 63, l. 1. r. *Formulianus*, p 73 l. 23. 11 r. l. 30. r. *Bishops*, p. 77. l 7, & 33, by Bishops, r. *beyond the seas*, p. 80. l. 33 your r. *our*, l. 38. a patris reverentia r. *qui a patria ratouis*, p. 83. l. 1. *all* r. *most*, p. 86. l. 5, 6. 7. r. *them to ordain and constitute*, p. 87. l. 31. r. *it is*, p. 88 l. 6. r *gifts*, p. 94. l. 23. are, r *as*, p. 93 l 83. r *excitaret*, p. 99. l. 19. r. *dimissionem*, p. 102. l. 3. *jurisdiction*. l 29. whose, r. *who*, p. 109 l. 9. r. *Aegyra Au*. 314. *can*. 18. *Eusab. Eccl. hist. l 6. c. 23. Epiphanius haref*. p. 121, l. 7. *dies*, p 122 l 20. *vera*, r. *vitæ*, p. 36. *debemsles*, l. 39. *jejunio*, p. 124 l. 31. *Ecclesiarum*, p. 125. l. 24. *videretur*, l. 29. *Ecclesiis scripsissis*, p. 126. l. 19. *quoque* p. 127, l. 19. *basis*, p. 128 l. 14. *sequimur*, p. 132. l. 21, *possessions*, p. 133. l. 2, *way*. p. 130. l. 5. *mutata*, l. 16. those r. *these*, p. 131. l. 2. *starve*, p. 836. l. 9. of, r. *or*, p. 134. l. 2. *Electionis*, l. 7. which, r. *wish*, l. 22. r. *Masculus*, l. 23. *Chemnisius*, l. 25. *Lombard*, l. 36. *externally*.

In the Margin, p. 15. l 40. 41. r. *Paulini ad Romanum*, p. 27. l. 8, 112. r 22. p. 49. l. 20. r. *resolve*, p. 51. l. 21. r. *Octavi*, p. 63. l. 21, 22. r. *causa*, p. 77. l. 3. *Camero*, r, *Cranmero*, p 78. l 2. r. *Popish*, p. 86 l 2. r. *Warrants*, l. 4 *Erastus*, l. 29 *mulier*, p 88. l. 45. *Palatine*, p. 96. l. 3. r *Gloria mundi*, p. 91. l. 4. r *pars*, p 95. l 13. r. 1603. *man*. 33 p. 98. l 11. *Cassianus*, p 124. l. 7. *mentis*, p. 129. l. 18 *Don*, r. *Dens*.